DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 277 UD 024 679

TITLE	Oversight on the Federal Role in Education (Part III). Hearing before the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Ninth Congress, First Session (New York, NY, February 19, 1985).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	85
NOTE	138p.; For parts 1 and 2, see UD 024 677-678. Some pages may not reproduce well due to small print. Serial No. 99-4.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Education; Educational Finance; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Government Role; Hearings; Minority Groups; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 99th

ABSTRACT

The proceedings of a House Committee on Education and Labor oversight hearing on the Federal role in education, and specifically on the impact of education budget cuts, are provided in this document. Included are a transcript of the hearing testimony, as well as prepared statements, letters, and other supplemental materials. The statements cover a wide range of education-related issues, including school dropouts, youth unemployment, compensatory education, teacher shortages, urban schools, early childhood education, minority students, and parent participation. In addition to a number of congressional representatives who presented opinions, the speakers included state and school district administrators, and representatives of various education advocacy groups, teachers' associations, and minority advocacy groups from New York, New Jersey, Maine, Vermont, and Connecticut. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OVERSIGHT ON THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION
(Part III)

ED265277

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN NEW YORK, NY, ON
FEBRUARY 19, 1985

Serial No. 99-4

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

UD024679

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
47-501 O WASHINGTON : 1985

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (Bill) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
TERRY L. BRUCE, Illinois
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
MERVYN M. DYMALLY, California
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR., Maine
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan

CONTENTS

Page

Hearing held in New York, NY, on February 19, 1985 1

Statements of:

Abdur-Rahman, Amina, coordinator, Educational Priorities Panel, New York City 99

Berry, Yvonne, Chairperson, The Coalition for Better Education in Public Schools, the United Community Centers, Brooklyn, NY 103

Brewer, Ross, Director of planning and policy development, Department of Education, State of Vermont 94

Christen, Barbara L., Principal, Murry Bergtraum High School for Business Careers 12

Fulton, Edithe A., president, New Jersey Education Association 42

Harvey, Thomas E., president, Maine Teachers Association 39

Hobart, Jr., Thomas Y., president, New York State United Teachers 49

Minter, Thomas K., dean, professional studies, Lehman College-cuny, Representing Benjamin L. Hooks, executive director, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People 84

Quinones, Nathan, chancellor, New York City Board of Education 7

Robinson, Stephanie, Ph.D., education director, National Urban League, Inc. 62

Rosario, Juan, national executive director, ASPIRA of America, Inc., New York 73

Sherman, David, assistant to the president, United Federation of Teachers 54

Townsend, Maida, president, Vermont National Education Association 36

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:

Abdur-Rahman, Amina, coordinator, Educational Priorities Panel, New York, NY:

Letter to Congressman Major R. Owens, dated February 26, 1985 enclosing requested information 110

Prepared statement of 115

Advocates for Children of New York, Inc., excerpts from the Report of the New York Hearing on Our Children At Risk: The Crisis in Public Education 124

Biaggi, Hon. Mario, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, prepared statement of 4

Brett, Leslie, Hartford Education Director, Connecticut Women's Educational and Legal Fund, Inc., letter to Chairman Hawkins, dated February 11, 1985 123

Christen, Barbara L., principal, Murry Bergtraum High School for Business Careers, prepared statement of 19

Jeffords, Hon. James M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Vermont, prepared statement of 22

Kaub, Shirley Jane, chair, Wisconsin Consortium for Sex Equity in Education, Madison, WI, letter to "Dear Mr. Jennings" dated February 5, 1985 123

Minter, Dr. Thomas K., representing Dr. Benjamin L. Hooks, executive director, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, prepared statement of 88

Mudgett, Richard P., Staten Island, NY:

"A Tiem for Reblz" article entitled 131

Letter to Congressman Mario Biaggi, dated March 5, 1985 127

"needid: mor reblz," article entitled 128

Page

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera—Continued
National Coalition of Title I Chapter 1 Parents, presented by Paul Weckstein, director of Washington office, Center for Law and Education, Washington, DC, prepared statement of 119
Robinson, Stephanie, Ph.D, education director, National Urban League, Inc., prepared statement of 66
Rosario, Dr. Juan, national executive director, ASPIRA of America, Inc., New York, NY, prepared statement of 77
Schulzinger, Rhoda, staff director, Full Access and Rights to Education Coalition, New York, NY, prepared statement of 120
Tirozzi, Gerald N., commissioner of education, State of Connecticut, letter to Chairman Hawkins, dated February 20, 1985 122

OVERSIGHT ON THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION

Part III

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1985

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
New York, NY.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 9:30 a.m., in the auditorium, Murry Bergtraum High School for Business Careers, New York City, NY, Hon. Augustus F. Hawkins (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Hawkins, Biaggi, Owens, Hayes, and Jeffords.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, counsel for education; Nancy L. Kober, legislative specialist; and Andrew Hartman, minority legislative associate.

Chairman HAWKINS. The committee is called to order.

At this time, I would like to get a few of the preliminaries out of the way. We do have a group of panels that have been put together from persons representing several States, obviously including representatives from the city of New York.

I would like to introduce the members of the panel from the very beginning. To my right is Mr. Charles Hayes, a Representative from the State of Illinois; and to my direct left is Representative Major Owens from the State of New York; and being interviewed and standing up, but who will soon join the panel, Mr. Mario Biaggi, a member of the committee and a Representative from New York.

The hearing today is the final day of three hearings that have been held across the country in various places, beginning in New Orleans. We have heard from parents, students, teachers, school administrators, superintendents, public officials, and community leaders. I think that overall it can be truthfully said that we have yet to locate a credible defender of the proposed cuts in education. At least we have not been able to find a person who would be willing to testify before an official body of legislative inquirers concerning the proposed cuts. We will be listening to Secretary Bennett a week from Thursday. We hope at that time to ask the Secretary his own views concerning the proposed cuts, and not necessarily his views that have been discussed in the media.

We feel that the reasons for this lack of defense for the proposed cuts, although often cited in rhetoric, are rather clear, that is that

the American public is being seriously misled concerning the budget cuts. Overall, the impression is given that defense as well as domestic programs is being cut. This obviously is untrue. Next, the public is not being told the real causes of the deficits. Although they are serious, and this committee is totally aware of the seriousness of the deficits, the real causes of the deficits are being concealed while education and other domestic spending, already drastically cut, are being blamed.

We never hear, for example, about the drastic tax give-aways that have been made since 1981, which has given rise to a loss in revenues. We never hear about the military weapons and the cost of those or who is going to pay for them, even though they are excessively high. We never hear about the interest payments due to high interest rates, and we never hear anyone mention the losses we have suffered as a result of the 1981–82 recession. But more specifically on education, we have seen in this committee the Federal support for elementary and secondary education drastically reduced. It was $7 billion in 1980; currently, while it is $7.3 billion in current dollars, if you adjusted, those dollars for inflation in just the same way that defense dollars are adjusted, the support now has been reduced from $7 billion to $5.1 billion in constant fiscal year 1980 dollars, a 28-percent loss. This loss would have been greater had Congress had approved all of the Reagan cuts in the past that were advocated.

Now the National Commission on Excellence in Education, the President's own commission, warned us of a rising tide of mediocrity in education. They said that this threatened our very future as a nation and as a people. With the proposed cuts on top of the other cuts since 1981, the threat of illiteracy is even worse than the threat of mediocrity, and it may be that as a nation we might be willing to settle for mediocrity, because the rate of illiteracy, more than 2 million persons a year, is being heaped on top of a number of 23 million Americans being functional illiterate and 70 million Americans on the borderline of functional illiteracy.

It is obvious, I think, from the hearings which we have had covering the 10 States in the deep South and the three States in the far West that the budget cutters are not eliminating waste, that the 25 percent cut in education is a lot more than cutting out fat. They are not eliminating unnecessary programs, but programs that have been proved to be cost effective and sound from an educational point of view and programs that have themselves been the means of reducing the only reductions in deficits that we have had. I think it was made well clear also that they are not helping the taxpayers, but only shifting the load from the Federal Government to State and local taxpayers as well as to parents and to local charities.

The best description that we have heard, in the opinion of the Chair, is that the real objective is contained in the observation of the mayor of New Orleans, Ernest Morial, who said this: "They are not only eliminating programs, but targeting the public school system for annihilation as well." We who believe in public education are thus being pushed into a more aggressive role by the Budget Director who would stifle equity and quality in education,

and a Department of Education Director acting more like an Office of Management and Budget Director.

These hearings in New York are not the end of the line for this committee. We will be traveling to other places. Mr. Hayes of Chicago has already moved ahead to make arrangements in the Midwest for another hearing, and we will go just as far and as often as possible to put education at the top of the Nation's agenda and to discuss specifically its role in eliminating the deficits and in pushing this Nation ahead for excellence.

At this time, the Chair would like to welcome again Mr. Biaggi of New York. I am sure that he, as well as our local Representative from Brooklyn, Major Owens, would like to have some expressions as well. Mr. Biaggi, we are delighted to welcome you, and we would like to hear from you at this time if you have some comments to make.

Mr. BIAGGI. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

In return, I would like to welcome you to the great city of New York, which has a great deal in common with your own constituency. You are talking about urban areas in the major cities of our country where the impact is most substantial and where these hearings, I am sure, will prove to be essential in addressing the President's budget proposal, a proposal which I believe, frankly, is DOA. As a former police officer, that is very significant, and most people know that it means dead on arrival. A practical assessment of his proposals tells us that there are ones that will not be accepted by the American people as represented by the Members of Congress.

But the importance of these hearings is to determine really what the impact of these proposals would be and just how we can reconcile the national interest in reducing deficit spending with an equally important national interest of preserving and enhancing the educational opportunities that the young folks and all people in our Nation should have. Clearly New York State would be affected to the tune of some $567 million in relation to higher education and elementary and secondary, as well as library services, refugee assistance and nutrition programs.

Under the proposed cuts of nutrition programs, there will be 224,000 young folks dropped from the program, a program that has been determined to be important and beneficial. Also, the cuts proposed for the student loan program, calls for a reduction of some 30 percent, which strikes the heart of the middle-income people in our country.

I served on this committee, as you did, Mr. Chairman—and you recall full well—when President Carter signed that legislation in West Virginia which put in place that last tile of the great mosaic which made it possible for every aspiring student to go to college and postgraduate school, something that was denied to contemporaries of ours in the early years. In the city of New York it was only City College that provided free education, and that had a limited accessibility. Others were required to forego that education perhaps until later years or to never get it at all. That legislation was one of the signal events in our Nation's history.

Now under the President's proposals there would be a substantial cut in the eligibility and the numbers would diminish. It is re-

gression, it is backing away from what we thought we had completed, and we take a dim view. I am sure my colleagues here, Mr. Owens and Mr. Hayes of Chicago, take a dim view of dismantling programs that we had worked so hard for and have served so well. In the end we are talking about developing the national resources of the American mind.

The President speaks, Mr. Chairman, of a freeze, and I think you made reference to it in your comments. A freeze across the board, I think, would find some reception in the American public in the sense of fairness, understanding that there is another national priority, the deficit. But this is not so. It is selective. Many programs are being eliminated entirely. Not simply in education, but across the board, programs that have been helpful are just being eliminated entirely. Other programs are, in fact, being cut as these education programs are being cut. At the same time we have the enhancement by some 12 percent of the defense budget. I don't quarrel with the need for defense. I am sure none of my colleagues do either, nor do any Americans. But if we are going to talk about equality and fairness, then let's supply it universally. I am sure we will be able to do that.

I know that the President argues that it is important that we have this 12 percent increase for defense in order to have military readiness. At the same time we are declaring war on the very system that will ensure civilian readiness.

Mr. Chairman, I have a larger statement which I will submit for the record. But more importantly, let me once again congratulate you for your leadership and the time that you have taken away from your family in having these hearings across the country. They are critical, and it is important that we hear not simply from the education community—people will discount that. They say there is a self-interest. Well, be as it may, that is an important area to hear from.

But we must hear from the parents and the young folks. I have already spoken to a number of students that aspire to have college education, some who are in college now, and they are terribly excited about what is about to happen, if we permit it to happen. We were able to thwart the interest of the administration in the last Congress when they made another effort to cut student loans and Pell grants. I am sure that, working all together and obtaining the facts and determining a real responsible assessment of the impact of these proposals, we will be able to, in the end, craft a piece of legislation that will be palatable. It may not be all that we like, but it would certainly be a substantial improvement over what the President proposes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Prepared statement of Hon. Mario Biaggi follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. MARIO BIAGGI A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

It gives me great pleasure to welcome the Subcommittee here to my home City of New York today as part of its regional hearings on the federal role in education—and the impact of the President's education budget for 1986.

I wish to especially welcome the Chairman of this Committee—Mr. Hawkins—who hails from the metropolitan area of Los Angeles and shares my concern not

only about this education budget but the budgets of the past four years which have attacked cities and services they provide to their citizens.

We also welcome our other colleagues from the Committee, Jim Jeffords, our new senior Republican member of the Committee—Bill Goodling, our senior Republican on this Subcommittee—and Charles Hayes—from the City of Chicago.

I am also pleased that we will be able to hear—for the first time before this Committee—our Chancellor Nathan Quinones. I am sure that his comments will give us a thorough snapshot of the role of the federal government in New York City's schools.

We will also hear from a number of other distinguished leaders in the educational community today and I welcome their testimony which will lend depth to our efforts to paint a national picture of the dismal impact of the Administration's budget proposals for education.

We see once again our priorities terribly distorted. We see an unabashed effort to trade educational opportunity for an expansion of an already-bloated defense budget.

This budget says that it is okay to spend $600 for toilet seats—and only spend 60 cents for a child's lunch.

I find it ironic that this budget proposes a 12 percent hike in spending for defense—in the name of military readiness. At the same time we are essentially declaring war on the very system that assures civilian readiness.

It was a little over two weeks ago today that this budget was delivered to Congress. The term that was given to it—which is just as applicable then—as it is today—was "D.O.A."—or— "Dead on Arrival."

It is a deceptive and dangerous budget—that will do little to relieve the deficit—but do a great deal to mortage our future.

Under this budget, programs for elementary and secondary education would be cut by $357 million—almost 5 percent from current funding levels. The budget for postsecondary programs would be slashed by over one-quarter—28 percent or $2.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman—I did not join you in New Orleans or in Los Angeles—but I bet that I can predict that you heard the same comments you will hear today. The federal role in education must be maintained—if we are to preserve and promote educational opportunity for all citizens.

It is said that the President proposes—and Congress disposes.

We should dispose of this budget—once and for all.

We should continue to hammer the message that these cuts—especially those in student aid—seek to close—not open—the doors of opportunity for students.

Let us be clear—that the priorities in the President's education budget must be considered—at the very least—an all-sides attack on programs which will result in an estimated $567 million loss to New York State alone.

What does this translate into?

Without a doubt—the largest impact will be felt in the postsecondary programs where New York students would lose $496 million in aid dollars.

In the Title I program for disadvantaged—we would lose $1.7 million.

In the Impact Aid program—which would be eliminated—we would lose $9.3 million.

In special education and rehabilitation dollars—we would lose $2 million.

In emergency refugee funds—we would lose $4.2 million.

In library programs—which also would be eliminated—we would lose $7.6 million.

And finally, in the school lunch programs—which propose elimination of subsidies to middle income students—we would lose $41 million which would drop 244,247 students from the program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that as we complete these coast-to-coast hearings today—that we can return to Washington with a loud and clear message to those in the Administration who think that these proposals have even a remote chance of passage in Congress. The case will be made for unilateral rejection of this budget—and the misguided sword of economy that has guided its development.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Biaggi.

Mr. Owens has been with us throughout the hearings and, I suppose, this presents an opportunity for him to return home and hear more directly from those surrounding the city of New York as well as those within.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, let me join Mr. Biaggi in welcoming the members of the committee to the world's greatest city and the

Nation's largest school system. As an expression of our gratitude, we have rolled out our best weather. We can't compete with Los Angeles, but I assure you that 47 degrees in February in New York is quite a commitment.

I am grateful to the committee for holding the hearings here in New York City because, whatever the problems we have heard enumerated from these representatives of the 10 States, I assure you I have heard nothing that does not exist to some degree in New York City. We have every kind of problem. The acute bilingual education problem of Los Angeles is probably matched only by the bilingual education problem in a place like New York City. Certainly all of the problems that our New York City school system experience are not due to Federal budget cuts, but a large number of these problems are greatly aided and the solutions to those problems are greatly enhanced with the aid of Federal money. The Federal budget cuts under the Reagan administration have placed a lot of pressure on our schools and exacerbated and worsened many of the problems that do exist. Some of our worst schools had been steadily improving in their reading and math scores until the impact of the Reagan budget cuts came home. Now we see some of those gains are being lost as a result of the kinds of pressures experienced by those cuts.

We here are convinced that education is as important to the national security of this Nation as any dollar spent for defense. We don't think you can separate the defense dollars from the education dollars or the education dollars from the defense dollars. We are locked in a long-term conflict, whether it is with the Soviet Union in terms of hostile conflict, or friendly conflict with the Japanese or the Europeans in commercial competition. It is a long-term conflict which requires that we have the best educated population possible.

It is shortsighted and represents Neanderthal thinking to assume that we can spend less for education than we spend for defense or that our educational expenditures should not be increased or should not have been increased over the years to match the gigantic increases that we have had in other areas, such as defense. I think we are like Sparta and Athens, two ways of life locked into conflict. The Soviet Union recognizes the value of education. Along with everything else they do, they have monumental expenditures for education. If we continue to insist on placing our heads in the sand and taking a Neanderthal and obsolete approach to our expenditures for education, our national security will be greatly harmed. Certainly the quality of life in our city suffers greatly as a result of failure to address the problems of education properly with the right amount of money and the right kind of management and the right kinds of attitudes.

We in this city would like to applaud the kind of school represented by the one we are sitting in, the kind of approach to education represented by this high school. The Murry Bergtraum High School is one that I have passed numerous times, because anyone who lives in Brooklyn and comes across the Brooklyn Bridge always sees this school. This is the first occasion that I have had to be in it. However, I did read at its inception about the kind of experiment that would be undertaken here. This is an academic high

school with an emphasis on business education. It is the kind of model that we would like to see replicated all over the city in that it recognizes the need for a basic fundamental academic education for every person who is educated and, at the same time, it recognizes the practical need for having some kind of orientation and training towards a career. So we applaud what Murry Bergtraum signifies in this city, the kind of example it has set.

Again, we are quite grateful for the committee appearing here in New York. This is a dialog that we hope will be stimulating. We hope that the dialog will be spread to more people and that a greater amount of pressure will be brought upon representatives at every level—at the State level, at the city level, as well as the Federal level—to do more for education and to do more to stop the kinds of budget cuts that we are about to experience.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you.

Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You and my other colleague have, I think, said adequately our purpose for being here. Therefore, I am not going to use up time so that we can hear our witnesses.

I am sure that today's session in our Nation's number-one city will be as the other two in the first series of hearings, that it will be both informative and productive. If the Congress of which I am a part has a receptive ear and is encouraged to do what is right for our leaders of tomorrow, we will eliminate and restore some of the devastating cuts proposed by our President, thereby giving the disadvantaged and the have-nots of our society an equal opportunity for an education that will prepare them to protect and expand and defend our democratic system without the usage of nuclear weapons.

Thank you very much.

Chairman. HAWKINS. Thank you.

The committee will be pleased to hear the first panel, Chancellor Nathan Quinones, Chancellor of the New York City Board of Education; and Mrs. Barbara L. Christen, principal, Murry Bergtraum High School for Business Careers. We are pleased to have both of you. Certainly, Mrs. Christen, the committee is deeply indebted to you personally for the hearing being held in the Murry Bergtraum High School for Business Careers.

I see we also have some of the students present in the audience, and it is possible that at the conclusion of this panel you may want to ask one or two of the students to have something to say if they are so inclined to do so. We are always pleased to hear from students as well as from those who are administrators in education.

At this time, Chancellor, we look forward to your testimony. All of the testimony will be printed in the record, and at this time you may address the committee in such form as you may select.

STATEMENT OF NATHAN QUINONES, CHANCELLOR, NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. QUINONES. Good morning, Congressman Hawkins, Congressman Hayes, Congressman Owens, and Congressman Biaggi. Mem-

bers of the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Educational, thank you very much for inviting me to testify here this morning.

Before I go on with my printed remarks, may I say very clearly that I am here to be one of those who has argued already before you in terms of the projected budget cuts. I want to dispell any possible doubts that might be lingering.

Beyond that, may I say that just to look at the budgetary record over these last 4 years, certainly from 1980 to 1984, will reveal that it is the urban areas that you well represent that have suffered a disproportionate amount of reduction, not only to our school systems but beyond our school systems. And it is that erosion from the Federal Government that I am here to argue against simply with one theme, that education is our best defense.

You will all receive copies of the board of education's Federal legislative agenda which contains a variety of specific proposals. Rather than discuss all of these, I would like to focus my remarks on what I believe to be the overriding problem that faces our Nation with regard to its youth, the increasing and alarming rate at which students drop out of school. As members of an important congressional subcommittee, I urge you to focus your attention on this problem, too, as you decide what legislation to support and initiate this year.

Before I go further, let me make one thing clear. I believe firmly in a strong Federal role in education. You and I both know that this position is opposed by the present administration. Nonetheless, I believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to those who have historically not been served or have been underserved by our public institutions. When it exerts this responsibility, progress is made. Look at Head Start. Look at title I. Progress has not been automatic or smooth. There have been difficulties in implementing these programs as intended, but there has been progress.

We simply cannot abandon the need for equity in favor of the current for excellence. True excellence will embrace equity, too.

Last year Secretary Bell released a report with which I am sure you are all quite familiar. In it he put the national dropout rate at 27.2 percent. Think about it for a moment. That means that, nationwide, nearly one out of every three students does not complete high school. For minorities and for big cities, the rates are much, much higher.

Students drop out of school for an amalgam of reasons, low achievement, personal crises, financial needs, and family problems. Not all of these can be addressed by school systems alone, although the schools must lead. They must assemble the forces to ensure that every student has a chance to reach his or her maximum potential.

We as a nation pay enormous costs when students drop out of school. We cannot estimate the cost of wasted potential, but it is clearly too high. The related costs of welfare, unemployment, and youth crime are more obvious. For example, a 1977 study by the Economic Development Council calculated that youth crime, most of which occurs during school hours, costs New York City alone $329 million a year. Also unacceptable are the costs of a growing

illiterate adult population. Clearly, a concerted and focused effort must be made to keep students in school.

In New York City, and in other big cities, reducing the dropout rate is compounded by many other problems. One of them is sheer numbers. In New York City, for example, our public school population is nearly 1 million. This population is a needy one by almost any measurement. For example, we educate almost half of the State's handicapped pupils, more than three-quarters of the students with limited English proficiency, and half of the students with basic educational needs. In addition, more than one-fourth of the city's children are supported by public assistance, one-third live in single-parent families, and well over half of the mothers with school-aged children work. Between 1970 and 1980, minorities became the majority in the city's 5-to-17 age group. Our population is richly diverse, yet often underprivileged or unsupervised at home. The education of our children presents unique challenges and difficulties.

Despite these difficulties, I am happy to report that student achievement in New York City has steadily improved in recent years. This is proof of our conviction that every child can learn. Thanks in part to Federal support such as title I/chapter 1, our students now perform above national norms on reading and mathematics tests. Despite more stringent promotional criteria, more and more of our students in grades one to nine are promoted each year. The percentage of high school seniors who graduate continues to rise, and the percentage of them receiving our highest diploma has increased substantially over the past 5 years to more than 40 percent of the graduating class last year. Our June 1984 graduates raised their average scores on the SAT by seven points over the previous year. Nationally the average rose by only four points. In addition, more students of varying achievement levels have taken the most academically rigorous courses and New York State Regents examinations. Certainly the school in which you are in is a marvelous example of what we are able to accomplish.

I could go on. There are many, many compelling statistics about the New York City school system. Let me leave you with one final contrast. Out of 300 Westinghouse science scholarship finalists in the Nation, 101—more than a third—are from New York City public high schools. But these honor students attend only 19 of our 110 high schools, and meanwhile our citywide dropout rate is excessive. New York City's school system is indeed a system of extremes.

What must be done to reduce the dropout rate? Like the problem itself, the solution must be multifaceted. There is no single answer, and there is no quick fix. We must take a number of approaches simultaneously, some directed at students who are in crisis, some directed at long-term prevention. Let me describe what I think you should support.

First, we must identify and meet children's needs before they become critical. This means that our efforts must reach all the way down to the earliest grades, where patterns of attendance and achievement are often set.

Educational research confirms the belief that quality early childhood education makes a lasting and significant difference in students' lives. The recently published report of the High/Scope Edu-

cational Research Foundation in Michigan demonstrates this even more convincingly than the previous Head Start studies. As you know, this report is the latest in a series that follows the progress of a group of poor minority children who participated in preschool education. Its conclusion that the early childhood experience led to markedly greater success in school and in employment for these young people is not surprising to you or to me. But the cost-benefit analysis is striking. The report estimates that the economic benefits to society and to these students, over the course of their lifetimes, may be more than seven times the cost of operating the program for 1 year. This is power ammunition indeed. Not only will good early childhood education help to create better lives for individual students, but it will benefit society as well.

We must also provide extra support services in junior high and high schools for our students most at risk of dropping out. We can identify these students. They have poor attendance records, have failed repeatedly in school, and are often overage for their grade levels. These students usually need many kinds of support: basic skills remediation, personal counseling, health services, employment counseling, family counseling, and sometimes just personal attention, a sense that someone cares if they do not show up at school.

All of these support services cannot be offered by the schools, although this is the logical place to coordinate them. In New York City we have a pilot project, Operation Success, in which an outside agency works with students in school to identify their needs, refer them to appropriate service agencies, and help them negotiate through the bureaucracies of those agencies. This program is quite successful and should be expanded.

The transition from junior high to high school is often critical for at-risk youngsters, a time when they can get lost between the cracks. We are just beginning another pilot program, Project Connect, that will provide extra support services to help ease this transition.

In addition to working with at-risk students, we must also provide extra support and incentives for troubled schools. We know that failing schools can be turned around. Our school improvement project and local school development project, both based on Ron Edmonds' principles of effective schools, have had marked success with individual schools, and there are other examples.

Samuel Gompers Vocational-Technical High School in the Bronx is one of these. In 1979, this school was in serious trouble. Fewer than 500 of its 1,500 students attended classes regularly, and only 45 percent of them read at or above grade level. Violence was rampant, with daily cafeteria riots, gang wars, and assaults on teachers and students. So we hired a new principal. In about 3 years he turned the school around. Last spring, 5,000 students applied for only 500 places in Gompers' entering class. Attendance has improved dramatically, and 67 percent of the students read at or above grade level. Let me cite that that school is located in the south Bronx.

These dramatic results were obtained by a combination of efforts much like what I have advocated here. In fact, I expect to an-

nounce soon a major new dropout prevention program in New York City that is aimed at high schools with accute need.

There is still more that we must do. I referred earlier to statistics about single-parent families and working mothers. These growing numbers have combined to create a phenomenon called latchkey children. According to published reports, there were 7 million latchkey children in 1983. Although research on this group is scanty, it indicates that many of these children exhibit academic and behavior problems in school. Our dropout prevention efforts must, therefore, take into account the special needs of children who are unsupervised before and after school.

I urge you to push for funding of last year's bill directed at latchkey children. We must initiate a variety of measures, including school-based child care, to provide support for working parents and their children.

Another effort related to dropout prevention is the improvement of our school buildings and facilities. Educational research has consistently demonstrated that the school environment has a direct impact on student achievement. And the physical plant comprises an essential part of the environment in which children learn.

In urban areas these facts take on added importance. In New York City, for example, over half of our school buildings are more than 50 years old. That fact, combined with a pattern of deferred maintenance and repair since the 1975 fiscal crisis, has resulted in serious deterioration throughout the city. We cannot expect students to learn or teachers to teach in a classroom where the roof leaks, paint chips off, and windows are broken. Nor can we expect to achieve excellence in schools with out-of-date and broken down equipment or with one computer for 500 students.

My final recommendation for reducing the dropout rate is one I urge you to consider most seriously.

I believe that we must stress employment preparation if we hope to keep students in school. By employment preparation, I mean a range of activities including career awareness, job survival skills, specific vocational skills training, mentoring experiences with job role models, work experience, summer and after-school jobs, and subsidized employment.

In New York City we are fortunate that local businesses and universities recognize their own need for well-prepared high school graduates. They have joined with the school system in a number of collaborative efforts to keep students in school and to prepare them well for either employment or postsecondary study. Many of these are very promising, though they do not yet begin to reach all students.

But a large problem remains. Although unemployment is dropping in general, youth unemployment, particularly for minorities, remains distressingly high. How can we hope to encourage students to stay in school when they find that the high school diploma doesn't, after all, get them a job?

In an ideal world, this is where the Federal Government would step in with subsidized employment. I urge you to think about this idea. Don't just dismiss it as unrealistic. On the one hand, we tell our young people that they need education to get ahead; on the other, we tell them that we can't help them find jobs. Isn't it our

responsibility—and by our, I mean all of us, public and private sector alike—to help these young people find productive, satisfying places for themselves? Whatever it costs to do this, it would be less than the costs of welfare, unemployment, and crime.

Higher education throughout the country has already done something analogous to what I am suggesting. Community colleges in New York State, California, and other States have opened their doors with open admissions policies, in effect, saying to students that a high school diploma guarantees them a place in college. Shouldn't we guarantee them a job as well?

Brief as my remarks have been, out of necessity, I hope that they have given you a sense of the massive, complex effort needed to reduce the dropout rate. Last year the New York State Legislature enacted an extraordinary piece of legislation, the Attendence Improvement and Dropout Prevention Program. This legislation targeted funds for exactly the kinds of efforts I have described. But it has only scratched the surface.

The time has come for all of us to join forces: the Federal Government, State and local governments, business and industry, colleges and universities, advocacy groups, community organizations, and the school system. The national call for reform has focused attention on our schools, and the recent national reports have made many suggestions for improving our educational system. Some of these are very useful. But very little attention has been given to funding the resources for reform. And, in fact, President Reagan's proposed budget will have devastating effects on New York City's schools and, I suspect, other dependent urban school systems.

That is why I say that we must join forces. Children are our most precious national resource. Any investment we make in them is also an investment in our Nation's future. If we try to save money today, our children will pay for it tomorrow, and so will we all.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Chancellor.

We will call on Mrs. Christen, and then we will ask questions of the two witnesses. Mrs. Christen, we welcome you as a witness to the committee.

STATEMENT OF BARBARA L. CHRISTEN, PRINCIPAL, MURRY BERGTRAUM HIGH SCHOOL FOR BUSINESS CAREERS

Mrs. CHRISTEN. Good morning.

Congressman Biaggi, Congressman Owens, Congressman Hawkins, Congressman Hayes, on behalf of the students, the staff and the administration of this school, I want to welcome you to the Murry Bergtraum High School for Business Careers. I want to thank you for the opportunity to address you this morning, to talk about the problems of education on the secondary school level as we view them from the field, to tell you about some of the good things that your Federal moneys have done for the school, and to talk about the areas of concern that I, as a secondary school educator, have for the education of the young people who are my responsibility.

First of all, I would like to tell you something about our school. I am delighted that Congressman Owens knows so much about it al-

ready, and I am going to fill you in on the details that he knows but hasn't explored for you at this time.

First of all, we are a school of 2,700 students. We are a very special school. We are very special, I think, in a way that will please you very much. In the 10 years of our existence as an institution, we have proved that you can indeed have a school of inner-city, largely minority students which prepares students successfully for both college and entry-level positions in the business community.

We graduated our first class in 1978, and in the years since then we have seen these young people move on to college and move back into industry, into the business community, in very successful and rewarding positions. It is a heart-warming thing.

There are, I think, four reasons why this school has been able to do what it has done. First of all, it does educate young people for both college and work. And from the moment that the young people come into the school, from the moment that they apply, they know that these are the dual objectives of the school. They can see our seniors working in part-time and cooperative jobs. Now they are beginning to meet alumni. They hear from our advisory board that indeed success can be theirs if they will take advantage of the opportunity that is presented to them.

We are an educational option school, 1 of the 110 high schools that Chancellor Quinones has spoken about. This means that we have no district. Nobody has to come to this school. That is rather a scary thought for the administration of any school. However, students do want to come. They come by application. Last year we had 38,000 applications for admission to this school. Of those youngsters, we were able to take approximately 850 in our entering 9th and 10th year classes.

Our students then come from all over the city. It is an integrated school, but largely minority—black, Hispanic, Oriental and white. About two-thirds of our students qualify for free or reduced lunch. Almost all of them travel to school via the subway, and they have many trials and tribulations getting here. But they do indeed come. Our attendance record this semester is running between 90 and 93 percent. That is among the highest attendance rates in the city.

We select our students, those 850 who do gain entrance, with the assistance of the office of high school admissions of the central board. We select them on a basis of 25 percent below grade level in basic skills at the time of application, 50 percent on grade level, and 25 percent above grade level. We are in no sense, thus, an elitist school. The student population of this school is a cross-section of the student population of the city. They come because they choose to come, they come because they see goals at the end of their 4 years which are capable of achievement, and they come every day.

The third reason, of course, why the school is successful, I believe, is because we do have a very intense concentration in business education. Through this concentration, students become aware of the value of basic skills. They see the practical application as they move through our programs of study of the skills which their English teachers and social studies teachers and mathematics teachers talk about and help them to gain.

A fourth reason why we are very successful, in my belief, is that we have had the opportunity to develop many liaisons with the business community here in downtown lower Manhattan. Since our earliest days, we have been sponsored by the Downtown Lower Manhattan Association. We have developed an advisory board which helps us with the formulation of our curriculum, which helps us to keep up to date with events and trends in the business community, and which very, very generously assists us in the development of internships, of work-study programs and job placements, through which our youngsters can move into the productive economic community.

I would like to take a few moments now to tell you something about how the Federal programs which are already in place have affected our school in very positive ways. The first program, of course, I don't think I need to say much about, and that is the food program. We deplore the cuts, as Congressman Biaggi has spoken of them. But there is no question that the federally sponsored breakfast and lunch programs are very helpful in giving our students the kind of start and little interruption in the day, which enables them to carry on through the day and to do their very best possible work.

Beyond that, a very significant area in which Federal funds have helped us is in the area of actual classroom instruction remediation. And the third area is in the area of equipment, and we will come to that.

Let's look first at instruction remediation. In this school we have four chapter 1 teachers. These positions enable us to set up very small classes, 15 to 20 youngsters to a class, and a paraprofessional teacher. I agree completely with Chancellor Quinones that the degree of personal attention that a student gets in a school is a significant contributory factor to his success in school. Recognizing that many an urban youngster has a very high degree of anonymity in his day, from the time he or she leaves his apartment in the morning through his travel on the subways, through his travel through the city streets, it is quite possible that no one knows his name, and that is not a good thing for an adolescent. When he gets to school, if someone knows his name, if someone cares—and our teachers do care, our staff does know his name—then he is in a far better position to benefit from the instructional programs that the teachers have developed than if he continues to be anonymous. The chapter 1 classes give us an opportunity to give to those children who are most in need of this personal contact the kind of support and the kind of individual instruction that is going to enable them to develop their potential.

In addition to the chapter 1 regular classes through the academic year, we have a very strong summer remediation program. It recognizes the plight of the incoming 9th and 10th grader. It recognizes that the adjustment from the lower school to the high school can be a very tough adjustment. It recognizes that traveling through the city can really be a rather traumatic experience for a youngster when first he undertakes it.

Through the Summer Remediation Program, we have an opportunity to introduce some of our incoming students to the nature of the school, to the location of the school, to the area in which the

school is located, to the resources of that area, and also to introduce him to some of the teachers who are going to be his teachers through his academic career in the school. We found in the course of the past 8 years that we have had this summer remediation program that the students who participated in it really do significantly better academically than their predecessors who had no opportunity to participate in that way.

In addition to the remediation school in the summertime, the board of education has sponsored at this school summer computer camps. These are wonderful things, absolutely wonderful. It is not just for students of this school, although many of our students are able to participate. But the summer computer camp brings together students from schools all over the city, gives them an opportunity to take subjects which perhaps they cannot take at their local school and, at the same time, develop job skills which ultimately enable them to gain entry into the business community. The remediation programs then enhance instruction and help the youngsters very, very much to take advantage of the high school subjects, the regular program of instruction, which will ultimately lead them to that diploma and to college and to work.

Come back to the fact that this is an educational option school and that our option is business education. In order to carry out that option, in order to train youngsters for entry-level jobs, we absolutely must have equipment. And we do—not as much as we would like to have, not as much as hopefully we are going to have, and perhaps not as much state-of-the-art as it should be. But we do have a good bit of equipment that has been funded through Federal funds which enables us to bring our youngsters up to date in skills which they can then transfer when they move into the business community.

We have about 50 Radio Shack microcomputers. These are used to teach computer applications in accounting, to teach computer literacy, COBOL, and word processing. They are distributed among three classrooms. The classrooms are used all day, every day, and the youngsters really do build skills in using this equipment, skills which are salable even while they are in high school. We have about 600 students in our junior and senior classes who are out there working in the afternoon in organizations in this downtown lower Manhattan area. They are very much in demand. We have more positions than we can fill, which is a wonderful thing for an inner-city school.

In addition to the computers, the Radio Shack micros, we recently received two rooms of new Smith-Corona typewriters, helping us to develop the program of instruction in the basic entry-level skill. If a youngster can type, we can get that young person a job. So every student who comes to this school takes typewriting upon entry, whether it be in the 9th or the 10th grade. It takes them a little while to realize that indeed everybody can learn to type. To some it is a struggle, but they do, and that becomes their readily salable skill.

Other Federal equipment that we have are 6 IBM display writers, 16 Adler text writers, and we have just received two rooms full of Tandy 1000 machines. These are being used in our secretarial studies program for the teaching of word processing, and they will

be the nucleus of the equipment which will enable us to develop a whole program beginning next year in information processing and office assistanceships. And we hope through this to enable even more youngsters to go out prepared to cope with the vicissitudes of life.

There are, however—and I would like you to know about this—certain problems with categorical funds. One of the problems has to do with flexibility. The remedial class carries no credit towards the high school diploma. Because it carries no credit, there is a certain degree of resistance on the part of the youngster to taking that class. Now we recognized—very, very definitely we recognize as educators—that Federal funds cannot in any sense supplant State or local funds. We have no question about that. We recognize that they must indeed supplement. However, I think that we can work out procedures which are a little more common sensical in terms of motivating the youngster to take full advantage of these funds.

The classes which are remedial, because they deal only with skills and not with the true application of these skills, present to the youngster a situation in which he is less likely to apply himself with the same intensity. It, therefore, leads the youngster to think this course does not count, a remedial reading class does not count as much as an English class, a remedial math class does not count as much as a math class. I think we have to take a look at ways in which we can utilize these funds just a little bit more effectively.

A particular problem arises through what we can double funding of targeted youngsters. If a child needs remedial reading and also needs remedial math, it means that two out of his seven periods a day are moved to another point in time. A ninth grader coming in will then only be taking five credit subjects towards his diploma. As we move towards the implementation of the regent's action plan, it is not inconceivable that a child could need remediation in three, or even four, subjects. And the ultimate result might be that the high school diploma would be deferred to the point where it would become very difficult for the youngster to obtain just because of the overfunding.

Again, I think we can devise different ways to do this. And let me suggest just one just to give an indication of the kind of thinking that can go in here. If the guidelines of the Federal funding were such that we could take 60 students who are in need of remediation in English, create the two tax levy crosses which we would normally create for them, and then supplement those two with an additional class for credit which would be federally funded, we could put those 60 youngsters into classes of 20 each. In such small classes, they could work intensely on the development of skills at the same time that they were working towards the mastery of subject matter. The motivation for the youngster would be far greater. The achievement, I believe very firmly, would be in direct proportion. So we would be maintaining that principle of supplementing at the same time that we would be responding to the needs of the child in perhaps a more practical way.

I note in reading the proposed American Defense Education Act and the Secondary Schools Basic Act as it is proposed that each of these addresses this kind of flexibility and seems to offer to the

school the opportunity to create the kind of program that will respond directly to the needs of its children without destroying that principle of supplementing.

Mr. Hawkins' Effective Schools Act recognizes very clearly that one of the most significant components in the success of the school is the level of leadership of the principal and the staff in the setting of instructional objectives for that particular school. And I would suggest, gentlemen, that if we really think highly of the judgment of the educational staff, it might be a good idea for us to place a little bit more faith in their ability to create the kind of program that will respond to the needs of the children.

Flexibility in equipment, this is another thing that perhaps we might like, again carrying out this idea of flexibility. When we got the new typewriters, we really wanted one kind of typewriter to ease the program of instruction across the board. Instead, we got a different kind of typewriter. When we got computers, we wanted several kinds of computers so that we could set up several different kinds of programs; rather than that, we got one kind of computer. Again, understanding the needs of the individual school and calling into play the judgment of the administration and the teaching staff could perhaps make the utilization of Federal funds a little bit more effective.

A second area that we would like to see Congress address attention to is the need to drive the maximum amount of money down into the classroom. As someone in the field, I have a very strong feeling that a great deal of money is being spent in the name of education, but that there is a great deal of it that is not coming into the classroom to educate the children directly. Very often we get the feeling in the field that far more is going for teams and conferences and convocations and task forces and staff cmts., and all of that sort of thing, and that the amount of money that is coming down to actually place a real teacher in a real classroom teaching real children with real resources, that money is diminished by some of the administrative costs.

Talking about real teachers brings me to the next area that I would like to address, and that is the concerns which confront the secondary schools today.

A primary concern of all administrators in this city at this time is the shortage of teachers. Right now in New York City, we do not have available any high school teachers. We have programs which are uncovered. We have vacancies in some of our schools. Either we are going to put unqualified people into those vacancies, or, as has happened already in some instances, we are going to cancel the classes, thus depriving the children of the opportunity for this kind of enrichment in their education.

It has been my experience when I have gone to nationwide conferences that the problems that beset New York City, beset areas outside the city—we have a very strong feeling that the crisis in numbers of teachers available which has now hit New York City is going to be a nationwide crisis very shortly.

A second area that the Congress might like to address is the area of the education of the minimal achiever. This is not in any way to say that we should turn away from the education of the child who is economically deprived or educationally disadvantaged. But there

are in our schools a vast number of youngsters who are probably part of this rising tide of mediocrity, who can read but just barely at grade level, who can write minimally, whose speech patterns are really those that we hear on television sitcoms, whose basic skills will enable them to get through the competency tests, but will not enable them to do a great deal more. This minimal achiever really needs to be reached through a variety of different kinds of courses. The courses we have here at Bergtraum present simply one way of reaching this youngster, by showing him the relevance between the classroom and the workplace, between the classroom and the college, and ultimately between the classroom and the kind of interesting life to which he or she really aspires.

There are many, many ways that this kind of program could be set up in other schools. It can be done, as Chancellor Quinones has indicated, through cultural resources, through additional guidance counselors, through the utilization of local resources, local talents, through the utilization of arts, or through the utilization of music. Whatever area will cause a child to respond is an area through which we can reach him to enable him to become truly interested in his education. Again, the American Defense Education Act offers this possibility. It offers the chance to develop in the schools, to bring money to the classroom and to supplement.

One need that I think really has to be addressed is the area of special education. I will limit my remarks on it, but there are two things that are very important to recognize. All educators applaud the concern of the Nation now for the education of those who are handicapped. There is no question that the Nation will be far better off if the talents and abilities of everyone are brought to the highest possible level. We recognize that the cost of educating the handicapped child or the child with special needs is a cost that runs to almost three or four times the cost of the average child. We would ask the Federal Government look closely at the needs of the child who has special problems and special handicaps and address its attention to that.

In summary, from the point of view of the field, Federal moneys that have already come into the schools have been very, very productive. They have been invaluable in helping us to meet the needs of all of our children. We would ask for a greater degree of flexibility, we would ask that there be more money brought into the classroom directly, and we would ask that the needs created by a teacher shortage, by the needs of the minimal achiever in the schools and by the demands of special education receive your attention in coming days.

I thank you very much for the opportunity to address you today. I again welcome you to our school, and hope that your day here is as productive and as responsive as you would have it be. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Mrs. Christen.

[Prepared statement of Barbara Christen follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BARBARA L. CHRISTEN, PRINCIPAL, MURRY BERGTRAUM HIGH SCHOOL FOR BUSINESS CAREERS

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, I am Barbara L. Christen, Principal of Murry Bergtraum High School for Business Careers. Thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today.

I'd like to first sketch a profile of my school for you, then discuss how federal programs benefit our students and what we would like to see in the way of federal initiatives.

This is a very special school. It's special because, in the ten years of our existence, we have *proved something important, something that I know will* be of interest to this committee. We have proved that a largely minority inner-city student population, functioning on all academic levels from low to high can be prepared for college and also can be prepared for entry level positions in the business community. Ours is an intergrated student body, one that is 85% minority-black, Hispanic, and Oriental—and 15% white. Upon graduation, 80% go right to college. Those who do not go immediately have little difficulty getting jobs. Many of these go on to college later, with tuition being paid by their employers.

Bergtraum is one of 110 public high schools in New York City. It is an educational option school, a magnet school, with 2,700 students. We have no district. Any eight or ninth grade student residing in the City can apply for admission. Last year, 38,000 students applied, of whom we could accept approximately 850. Our students come from all five boroughs. About two thirds of them qualify for free or reduced price lunch. Most travel to school by subway.

Four aspects of our school in particular make us special and have contributed significantly to our effectiveness.

1. We prepare students both for college and for work in the business community.
2. We deliberately select 25% of our students on the below grade level in reading, 50% on grade level, and 25% above grade level.
3. Our magnet, or educational option, is business education. We have the strongest programs in the nation, in computer science, accounting, marketing, secretarial studies, and securities and finance at the secondary level.
4. We have developed many liaisons with the business community here in Downtown Lower Manhattan. Our Advisory Board works with us on curriculum and on our Varied Internship Programs. Through these, we place students in supervised work/study situations. We participate vigorously in the life of Downtown Lower Manhattan and gain entree for our students to positions in many corporations and agencies in the area.

With regard to the work of this Committee, let us look briefly at how federal money helps the students in this school. It happens in three important ways: through the food program, by providing remedial instruction, and by providing capital equipment which is the basis of our educational option program in business education.

About the first, the food program which provides both breakfast and lunch, I think we need say little more than that it certainly responds very effectively to real needs. It is an excellent program.

Let's look specifically now at classroom instruction. In this school, we have four Chapter One teachers, three in remedial reading and one in mathematics. These enable us to put students into small classes with a paraprofessional as well as a teacher to bring their basic skills up to the level necessary for high school work. Chapter One is of great value because it gives the student personal attention in a critical area with materials adequate to his needs.

In addition to remedial classes in our regular programs, federal funds have supported summer remediation programs for low-achieving students prior to their entry into the ninth grade. Federal funds have also supported summer "Computer Camps" for students from many schools, including this one.

The summer remedial program is wonderful. It enables children to work in small groups with some of our regular teachers whom they will continue to know and work with in the regular academic year. The students become familiar with our building, the area, their trip to school, and our personnel. They receive instruction in basic skills in small groups, have an opportunity for cultural development, and begin to get a feeling for our magnet, business education. It's a wonderful program. We have found that students who have participated in the summer remediation program have a greater academic success as a result of it.

The summer Computer Camp program is equally wonderful. It gives students a chance to study subjects that might not be part of their regular school program and to learn real job skills.

Moving from remediation to equipment, I can tell you that federal funds have provided much of the recent capital equipment that we have in this school which enables us to prepare students for employment. Our fifty Radio Shack microcomputers and printers are distributed among three classrooms and are used daily in teaching computer applications in accounting, computer literacy, and Cobol. They are also used to teach word processing. We recently received two rooms of new SCM typewriters, which help to teach the whole incoming class the fundamental entry level skill of keyboarding.

Our six IBM display writers and sixteen Adler Text Writers are the basis of our word processing component for our senior secretarial studies majors, and, with the two new rooms of Tandy 1000's, will enable us to have an Information Processing/ Office Assistant major next year. Because these students are well taught in the academic area as well as well-trained in their business skills, they have many opportunities open to them for employment upon graduation. They are in great demand.

I think you can see readily that federal funds are well invested in this school.

There is always room for improvement in education, though, and I know that you're interested in how we might use federal moneys even more effectively. It can be summed up in two phrases: flexibility and greater application to the classroom.

Categorical funds create some problems in the high schools. Greater flexibility in the regulations might diminish these.

1. Remedial classes carry no credit towards the high school diploma. Therefore, the eyes of many students, they "don't count." Sometimes students resist being placed in such classes; they see them as "kid stuff."

2. Because in a remedial class the skill is disassociated from its purpose—e.g., the purpose of reading is learning a body of subject matter or it is recreation—the student often does not apply himself as intensely to the acquisition of the skill as he would in a subject area. To put the child in a very small social studies of English class, where reading skill as well as subject matter could be pursued, or in a small mathematics class where basic computation can be pursued, would be a more effective use of dollars and time. Reading, writing, and computation are tools and will develop best when used as tools and not as ends in themselves.

3. Chapter One creates a problem in the high schools by slowing a student's progress toward the diploma. A ninth year student in this school, for example, should be taking seven subjects for diploma credit. With lunch, that's a full day: 8:05 to 2:20. If he has a remedial reading class, he must defer one of his seven required subjects, usually foreign language. If he is eligible for a remedial math class as well, he will have to defer another diploma course, but he cannot defer English or mathematics, he should not defer social studies or typewriting or science, and he cannot defer physical education. Many times a school will turn down a federally funded program because it is targeted to students who are already in such programs. The money, then, is not used.

I recognize and applaud the concern of Congress that federal funds not supplant local funds in education. I agree completely that they must supplement, I think, however, that we can address the needs of educationally deprived students in more commonsensicial ways. What we need is flexibility at the building level.

If, for example, the principal could take sixty students in need of language arts remediation, create the two tax levy credit classes to which these students would normally be assigned, add one Chapter One class for credit and distribute the sixty students in three classes of twenty each, reading skills could be developed while being applied. It would be effective, it would be for credit, and it would not supplant local money.

Applying the concept in this school, basic skills could be very effectively developed in very small secretarial studies classes as well as in small social studies classes or career exploration classes. If the principal had the flexibility to use the resources of his teaching staff and the particular elements of his school, he could, within the limitation of supplemental money, develop an effective program based on the teaching of basic skills. The proposed American Defense Education Act and the Secondary Schools Basic Skills Act seem to provide this opportunity.

Mr. Hawkin's Effective Schools Act recognizes as the most important criteria for an effective school one in which there is "strong and effective administrative and instructional leadership . . ." If you really believe that the judgment of the principal and staff are important, try to work out a procedure which allows for its exercise.

This flexibility should extend also to the selection of equipment. As it is, we have little choice: in the case of typewriters, we got different kinds, but for the most effective instruction we really wanted all the same kind. In the case of the VIP computers, we really wanted 3 different kinds to provide for different subjects and programs, but had to take 3 rooms of the same equipment.

Furthermore, the distribution of equipment to schools should be based on whether indeed a school can use it effectively. That clause in the American Defense Education Act which gives additional money when and if the goals are reached, at least recognizes the issue and addresses it.

A second refinement that I as a principal would seek for the use of federal funds is greater assurance that the money will be driven down into the classroom. I have a feeling that a great deal of money is being spent in the name of education, but that far too small a proportion is actually going into classrooms to educate children. Far too much goes into teams of researchers, evaluators, roving supervisors, writers of reports, trainers, and large numbers of personnel who never actually deal with children. The only way we're going to educate children is to put real teachers into real classrooms with real resources.

That brings us to the areas of great concern in the high schools today which Congress should be looking at. The first of these is the shortage of teaches. We face a crisis. In New York City now there are no high school teachers available in any subject area. There are high schools in which a number of positions are vacant.

This means, of course, that some of the people that are presently filling positions are unqualified and really incompetent, but they will stay on because anybody at the front of the classsroom is better than nobody—usually. In the case of an elective subject, the class may be cancelled. A whole generation of teachers is now missing and something drastic has to be done if elementary and secondary education is to be saved.

Another area that the Federal government should address is the education of the minimal achiever: the student who doesn't qualify for remediation; who passes the competency tests, but just barely; who is just on grade level or just below; who may not be "economically deprived", but whose home and backgound are in no way geared to educational achievement.

This is the student who reads, but neither well nor of his own volition; who can write, minimally; whose speech is patterned on the televison sitcoms and whose grasp of history and science would eliminate him on round one of the local quiz show. He's part of that "rising tide of mediocrity" that the National Commission discovered. He can be reached, but not in classes of 34. His interest in learing can be sparked, but not unless subjects and courses are offered through which it can happen. Here at Bergtraum, we do it through business education, and through opportunity for the student to participate in the business world while still in school, to see and to hear educated people at work in interesting jobs and with interesting lives.

In any school, programs to enrich the curriculum through the arts, through occupational education, or through the development of local resources can expand a student's horizons and raise his educational sights. School should be interesting and even fun; it can be.

The American Defense Education Act seems to offer the possiblity of doing this. Again, I would want to be sure that the money it would provide would come directly into the schools and not be channeled into offices and task forces and committees. I would want teachers and technology and communication skills and to have the time in their day to do it. That's how the best and the most enthusiastic teaching takes place.

A final area for Congressional attention is that of Special Education. While educators applaud the emphasis of the courts on the rights of the handicapped to full education, we are bent low under the costs and the restrictions of obeying court orders and guidelines. Special Education costs easily three times as much as regular education; these costs are born by the local taxpayers. The number of Special Education students in New York makes these costs very high. In fairness to all, the Federal Government should look at ways to help with the problem.

In summary, the federal funds provided for direct classroom instruction and for equipment are of great value to this school. Greater flexibility for the building principal would enhance that value. We must always recognize that these funds must supplement and not supplant local funds. Procedures should be developed to insure that a maximum proportion comes directly to the classroom. It is the teacher who makes the difference in the education of the child, not the headquarters team or the report-writer.

Further areas of concern that the Congress might wish to address are the shortage of teachers, the need to assist the minimal achiever, and the needs of Special Education.

I very much appreciate the opportunity to appear here today and discuss the benefits and results of federal programs. As you can see, federal dollars have made a very positive and critical contribution to the educational successes of many of our

students. We are grateful for the continued support and interest you have shown in the federal role in education. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. The committee has been joined by Congressman Jim Jeffords, the ranking Republican member on the full committee. Mr. Jeffords, we are delighted to have you. At this time, we will question the witness, but if you care to have an expression at this time, we would be very delighted to hear your comments, if the witnesses would yield for the purpose of this introduction.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I do have a statement, which I would like to put in the record.

I am just pleased to be here, and say that I was here several years ago on similar hearings in New York City, and I will be interested in finding out what progress or what direction things have moved since that time. So I am looking forward to the questioning. I appreciate the opportunity to be here. Certainly I want to commend you for holding these hearings around the country and for your deep interest in the very difficult problems we face as we go forward trying to redefine—or perhaps hold—the present definition of the Federal role in education. These are very critical hearings, and I appreciate very much the witnesses who are here to testify to guide us in this difficult time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Hon. James Jeffords follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VERMONT

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to say I am pleased to be here in New York and be able to participate in this, the third and last, field hearing of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education.

As the new ranking member of the full Education and Labor Committee I am looking forward to working with the Chairman and other members of the committee on the important task of improving education in this country.

I have just come from two days of hearings in Vermont held to discuss the Higher Education Act. While the process of examining that legislation and reauthorizing its important programs is high on the agenda of the committee, the national concern about elementary and secondary education mandates that we pay close attention to the early educational years as well.

Today's hearing comes at a time of great concern over the burgeoning federal deficit. The Administration, many members of Congress and the American people recognize the danger inherent in $200 billion federal deficits. The atmosphere in which we hold these hearings is one of controlling the federal budget by limiting spending.

If this hearing is to be truly productive in improving the condition of elementary and secondary education then we will have to talk about how we can better utilize the resources at hand, and not just about more funding. While adequate funding for education is important, we must keep in mind our economic responsibilities. Federal resources are not limitless. While improving the quality of education and controlling the federal deficit seem to be conflicting objectives, we must work together to achieve both these goals.

State and local education agencies have heard the call for improvement in the educational system which serves our young people. The initiatives and reforms which have resulted vary from place to place in response to the specific problems being addressed. I believe that these state and local efforts must be the heart of true educational reform.

This is not to say that the federal government does not have an important and essential role in this process. It does. What we need to learn today is how best might this role be carried out. What should be the limits of federal involvement in education? I look forward to hearing from the professional educators and concerned citizens gathered here today on these questions and the many others which I am sure will be raised.

In closing, I would like to thank Chairman Hawkins for allowing Maida Townsend and Dr. Ross Brewer to participate as witnesses at today's hearing and to provide us with a Vermont perspective.

Chairman HAWKINS. The Chair would like, first of all, to ask Mrs. Christen in connection with your statement on page 5 about the shortage of teachers, what suggestions you might have as to what at the Federal level can be done in connection with this serious problem that we have heard about across the Nation. Apparently you indicate there is an extreme shortage, many positions are vacant, which seems to suggest that testing or even raising the standards would not, as such, deal with this problem, but would probably even make it worse in that if you attempted to eliminate what one would look upon as incompetent teachers, you would have still fewer. Just what suggestions would you have for offering some solution to this problem?

Mrs. CHRISTEN. Congressman, the first suggestion I have is that the salary scale be raised. There is no question, particularly here in New York City, that the starting salary of young teachers is just so low, in the area of $14,000, that we cannot begin to attract the young people of ability that we need. We cannot begin to attract any young people. I think that is the first thing.

The second thing is a little bit more difficult to achieve, and that is an elevation of the prestige of the teaching profession. Many teachers do not feel that they have the level of respect, the level of appreciation, that members of other professions have from the populace at large. And whatever we can do to raise that status, that prestige, is going to be of value.

Some of the things that can be of value are the kinds of recognition programs that New York City has already begun for its teachers, the kinds of treatment in the programs through press, through publicity, through public relations that might bring before the public recognition of the difficulties of teaching, of the rewards of teaching, and of the achievements of specific teachers.

I think, for example, of a small but wonderful thing that was done a number of years ago at Georgetown University. I understand they do it every year, but it had an impact upon New York City 3 or 4 years ago.

Every year when the incoming class gets to Georgetown, the university asks the students to nominate for an award an outstanding high school teacher, who could in some way be responsible—who has been in some way responsible—for that youngster's getting to Georgetown. And about 4 or 5 years ago, the name of a teacher of English at the Bronx High School of Science came before the committee, and had come before the committee over a period of years. And that teacher was brought to Washington in June, granted an honorary doctorate, and I think every teacher in the New York City Public School System felt good because of it. It was a recognition well deserved.

In addition, quite possibly programs through which the universities work directly with the schools in the training of teachers to a degree that has not yet occurred, perhaps such a program would help. For example, the real training of a teacher occurs in the classroom. A certain amount of theory has to be imparted, a general knowledge of how you approach the breaking up of a subject into

its segments so that it can indeed be imparted. A certain amount of knowledge of how you set the stage so that skills can be developed, this knowledge is necessary in the days before a beginning teacher walks into the classroom. But it is in the classroom, under the supervision of experienced teachers, that young teachers learn their skills and begin to taste the rewards—and they are indeed many—of teaching.

In some countries, that I am aware of, beginning teachers are given not a full program, but a half program. I was visiting one school system last summer where the vocational education teachers particularly came into the school directly from industry, but were given just a half a day's teaching program. The other half of the day they worked under the supervision of other teachers. They worked at honing their skills, they worked at planning their lessons, and learning about the skills of pedagogy. That system works very well. It is certainly something that we might look at. Whether the Federal Government could set up a program or participate in such a program in some ways so that people could be brought into the teaching profession with a greater degree of ease than we are now able to do it is something, I think, for us to consider.

Right now a person comes into the school system and immediately is teaching in the high schools five subject classes, probably has an official class and probably has a building assignment. It is a very rigorous day. It is exhausting, and it leaves little time for the kind of thoughtful discussion with one's peers that would help a teacher to develop skills.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you.

Mr. Jeffords.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I think there is a recognition that we have to increase the effort in education. The question is: From whence should the money come? The Administration feels very strongly that we ought to reduce the Federal role in providing funds. The pressures on the cities, especially in the property tax area, indicate that we ought to give further assistance there. The States feel that they don't have the wherewithal to do it.

Mr. Quinones, let me ask you, is there a possibility in New York City for the city to pick up increased costs of education and, if so, how much? What do you feel the Federal role should be and what should the State be doing? If you can answer all of those in one minute, you are doing well.

Mr. QUINONES. Let me put this in the context of Vermont, because when we look at the needs of students in urban areas, they are not too dissimilar from students in rural areas. The disaffection, the sense of lack of purpose, indeed truancy and dropouts we see more uncommon between urban areas and rural areas in this country.

More to your point is that, if anything, we can't even think of applying the notion of freeze to students' needs, because their needs continue to increase, not even to stay at the status quo. We look at the divorce rate in this country and the issues of abandonment, of illigitimate births—out-of-wedlock births—we look at the instances of child abuse. All of these are focused where it is the young who are the recipients of brutality, physical as well as psy-

chological. So to say that we should now increase the amount of contribution from only one source of our society, I think, is grossly unfair, particularly when it is the urban areas of this country that have disproportionately absorbed reductions.

Having said that, we are also not precedent-setting here. When we go back to Sputnik, if you recall, back around 1957-1958, we rallied this country with almost national alarm that we had a lot of catching up to do in the area of education, and we did that fairly successfully. We certainly recognized the need to provide our returning veterans with schooling. All of those factors reaped benefits not just to New York City and not just to Los Angeles, they reaped benefits to the country as a whole.

So the issue is one here that there is a role for the Federal Government that has to be borne in a much more aggressive manner than has taken place, certainly over the course of these last few years.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Let me follow that up with one additional point. We are entering an age where the modern technology may assist us in educational fields. What concerns me is the point that you made, the areas that may benefit tremendously from it are suburbia, and the urban and rural communities may be left in the dust by the inability to provide the capital necessary to take advantage. Do you feel that is a real problem?

Mr. QUINONES. I think that when you are having a bifurcated society, clearly we are again—the communities that we normally associate with surburbia are fairly affluent and well established. Certainly they have their own amount of social instability also. But in terms of relative comparison, that certainly is so. And we see that our schools nationally in the urban areas are receiving more minority students, more impoverished students, more students suffering from family breakups, et cetera, et cetera.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Biaggi.

Mr. BIAGGI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Very quickly, Mrs. Christen, in relation to respect for teachers, I think you will find that the salaries clearly are important, especially the starting salaries. Salaries are disgraceful in this town, and clearly that contributes to a great deal of the shortage of teachers. They are inextricably interwoven with respect. I think you will find a whole change in attitude with the improvement of the system, parents will feel better about the system and the teachers, there will be greater participation, and they will see a better product and respect will go up.

I don't think that the teachers don't have respect today. I think teachers have always had respect and will continue to have it. I know there are pockets and areas where respect is partial—partial, not universal. And you will have in many schools, little pockets in all different schools, where there are criticisms. But I think the criticisms are founded on the product, on what has happened to the system. But the reports, and Chancellor Quinones' statement clearly shows that there has been an increase in the New York City School System as far as effectiveness is concerned. And I think you will find that developing.

One question, Mrs. Christen, that is very important. You say money should be driven down. Clearly money should be driven down. We believe that. When we appropriate funds at the Federal level, I am sure the State and the city would like to have that money driven down to the classroom. It is an ideal objective. Now how do you do it? What are the difficulties? What are the obstacles?

Mrs. CHRISTEN. I think you do it by setting the guidelines in such a way that percentages for administrative costs come off the top, but are limited to a greater degree than perhaps they are. I think you do it by recognizing that within the school, the development of the program can be achieved much more successfully for the students who are to be served—that development can be achieved more effectively within the school than it can from without.

The programs which we have developed in this school have been developed with our students in mind. There are things which we would like to do. There are kinds of classes we would like to set up. There are programs which we would like to initiate, but for which we do not have the funds. If Federal funds could be made available in such a way that this school would be able to exercise its initiative in these areas—and that has to be done through the guidelines—then I think that the moneys could be a little more successfully used.

Mr. BIAGGI. Excuse me. But moneys are coming through now.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. Yes, no question about it.

Mr. BIAGGI. Are they being driven down? Apparently they are not being driven down universally. From what I understand, you are saying that each school, the administration of each school, is responsible for that money being driven down. Do I understand you correctly, Mrs. Christen?

Mrs. CHRISTEN. I am sorry?

Mr. BIAGGI. Do I understand you correctly?

Mrs. CHRISTEN. I am saying that not enough of the Federal moneys are coming into the classroom, that a greater percentage of the Federal moneys could come directly in to be used for the children in the classroom. There ought to be more teachers and fewer administrators. There are administrators outside of the school.

Mr. BIAGGI. I think you will find a large body of support for that thinking.

Chancellor Quinones, at the outset you made a statement which I think should be focused on for a little while so we will understand the true nature of what is happening in Washington. The Federal Government wants to get out—at least this administration wants to get out—of the business of education. They want to get out of the people's business generally as a matter of policy. There are people who support that, and there are others who disagree.

Now if we permit that to happen, we will find ourselves confronted with a situation in this country where some States will attempt to compensate for the removal of funds, and some localities will do that. But I think that, on the most part, though a void will be created, in the end the education system will be deeply affected. So I think we should talk in terms of that philosophy and address ourselves to it and not lose sight. I also believe that Secretary Bennett shares that philosophy, and that kind of frightens me.

On page 8 you talked about the environment, the impact of the physical plan. I know that Chairman Hawkins introduced legislation in the last Congress, the Community Renewal Employment Act, which would address itself to that, and he has done it again in this Congress and I cosponsored it. It also would permit the community to get involved and create some jobs.

How much money do you think would be necessary to rehabilitate the schools in the city? If you have that figure offhand, fine; if you don't, we would appreciate——

Mr. QUINONES. We don't, but we could certainly provide that for you.

Mr. BIAGGI. OK. On page 9 you make reference to a collaborative effort between school and business. The Murry Bergtraum School is ideally situated, but I think it is unique. I think we must talk in terms of a general application. Is the curricula today geared so that you are talking about vocation as well as the academics? Is it tied up with industry? We know there are certain school systems in the country that have a direct relationship with large industries, and they gear their curriculum so that the student is involved and is learning with the machines that the company provides, so that, when he graduates, he can go right into the industry that has jobs available. Do we have it here?

Mr. QUINONES. We have some. Certainly a marvelous example of that is right here in this school, and the Norman-Thomas School has a similar program to this school, but insufficiently.

By the way, there are two elements involved here. One is the cost of the equipment, and certainly the dramatic changes that take place just in computer education. Not only is it costly in terms of obtaining that equipment, but in terms of maintenance as well.

Beyond that is that most of the individuals who come into our vocational and occupational programs do so as a second career. By and large, their average age is in the high 50's. The last time we did an analysis, I believe that the average age was about 57. Now many of those individuals are very reluctant to come into a school system where the rate of pay is at such a level that—you know, you talk about a former plumber coming into our school system or an electrician. We are not even competing with unskilled labor in terms of cost when it comes to attracting teachers.

Mr. BIAGGI. We are familiar with the general problem.

You make reference to latch-key children. What have you done locally with the funds that you have in that connection?

Mr. QUINONES. Practically every community school district has some after-school program. In some instances the parents have to pay a portion of that money. In a number of other instances, what you have is a combination of school funds matched with community-based organizations also contributing, as well as city agencies, the Youth Bureau.

However, this is still a small proportion of children. It should not be based solely on cost and whether a parent should afford it, and our programs should be expanded so that they are just are not custodial care. They should provide enrichment, and they should certainly also provide remediation. It is clear that many of these youngsters go home to an empty apartment, watch TV passively, have no other interrelationship with an adult and, when the adult

or adults do come home, they are tired and they have to prepare dinner. So the youngster is now shunted more to an existence of isolation.

Mr. BIAGGI. What you are proposing is the optimum, but we haven't even reached the first step universally, not even custodial care.

Mr. QUINONES. Yes.

Mr. BIAGGI. You and I know that we have so many working mothers out there in single-parent families who are concerned about what happens to their children. Oftentimes they can't maintain employment.

Mr. QUINONES. That is right.

Mr. BIAGGI. So it is a circle. It is a circle you just can't get away from.

But I think that, initially, the custodial care should be expanded.

Mr. QUINONES. Exactly.

Mr. BIAGGI. That should have a great impact on the economy. It should be consistent with this administration in the ability to get people working, get revenue into the government and, at the same time, they can be comforted in the knowledge that their children are in school, in a sense.

Of course, to have the optimum, the thing you are seeking, would be the ideal.

Mr. QUINONES. You should know also, Congressman, that we provided day-care facilities in a number of our high schools for those young women who have given birth and then don't have anyone to take care of the child. Were we not to do so, we would be having these young women remaining at home, probably on welfare, and not being educated. Here we are at least providing them with an opportunity for day care that is within the school site itself and giving them an opportunity to get a high school diploma.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. May I add something?

Mr. BIAGGI. Yes, sure.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. May I return to what Chancellor Quinones said about the schools which have successful business programs and to the question that you raised?

I think that what we do here is a very good example of this sort of driving down of moneys that I am talking about. What we do with the business community in this school we have done out of our own resources. We have staff whose job it is to develop the liaisons with the business community for this school. We have teachers whose job it is to not only teach classes, but also to supervise the youngsters who go out to work, to see that they are evaluated, to see that their needs or their deficiencies are addressed when the evaluations are not satisfactory.

There is a discretion which I as principal have with the advice of my staff in the use of my own resources within the school. And it has been a conscious decision on our part to place the greater portion of those resources—because they are indeed limited—into this area. And as a result of that decision, we have been able to develop the fine liaisons which we have. Had we more money, we would be able to do more of it, as well as to do some of the things we don't do, in the area perhaps of art or music or areas which are very, very necessary for the success of an excellent high school.

But this is the sort of thing that I am talking about. The opportunity for a school to design its programs to meet the needs of its children as they are known to the school is an opportunity that I think could be expanded.

Mr. BIAGGI. Clearly you are doing it here. I am talking about as a matter of policy in all the schools.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. Yes.

Mr. BIAGGI. I think that is something we should work on.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. I believe firmly, though, that every school exists within a community which offers very specific resources. They may not be the same resources as those which we have, but they are resources that can be developed.

Mr. BIAGGI. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Owens.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chancellor, I clearly believe that we should be spending far more in education at every level, starting with the Federal Government. I think our perception of what needs to be spent for education lags far behind our perception of what needs to be spent in other areas, like defense and business. There has been an enormous increase in the kind of expenditures we make, say, for fighter planes. The first fighter planes the United States ever contracted for cost less than $100,000, and now they cost around $18 million or $19 million. An aircraft carrier will cost $3.5 billion. We understand that the costs have gone up and the complexities of the world make it necessary to require better expenditures in these areas. But in an area like education we have Neanderthal thinking that goes back to the 1940's and to the early 1950's. So we are spending far too little.

However, one argument that the President will use—he has already used it and he will use it even more—is that the commitment at the local and the State levels are not great enough. We have an acknowledged surplus in New York City. We acknowledge that our surplus for the last fiscal year is $500 million. And when we admit that we have $500 million, my experience in city government lets me know that we have far more than that as a surplus.

What commitment has the city made, additional commitment, to education? These are funds that may not be there continuously, so you can't slot them into your operating budget, but for equipment and capital expenditures for the kind of equipment that is needed, a school like this could be the beneficiary of this surplus. I also think our State will definitely have a surplus and we are, of course, giving tax cuts, et cetera.

The President is going to score when he says that we are not interested in education at the New York City and New York State level if we don't allot considerable percentages of our surpluses toward education here.

Am I wrong? Have we done it already? Has the city made a commitment, some special commitment, out of the surplus? Has the State made some new commitments to education? Could you tell us and bring us up to date on that?

Mr. QUINONES. We are just in the process of that negotiation right now. The executive budget of the Mayor has made some comments, but not as specific as I am sure that they will be, and ones

that we will be pressing for. The Governor of the State of New York has made some specific recommendations in terms of the improvement of the moneys coming increasingly into impoverished areas, by the way, which is, I think, a breakthrough of the kind of grandfathering that has existed heretofore.

But let me say that just as our press is before you in increased moneys from the Federal Government, I am fully in accord with you that that can't now leave the municipal and the State governments satisfied with, whatever their contributions may have been in the past, even as being sufficient for the needs of education.

Mr. OWENS. Could you be a bit more specific, Mr. Chancellor? I am told that some adjustments were made on some aid formulas from the Federal Government to the city a few months ago, and that New York City got more money from the Federal Government. And I am told that the Mayor then pulled out some city funds of equal amounts, so we had no gains. I would like to hear more about that. I am told that for certain funds that do come into the city, like the Truancy Prevention Funds, the formulas are such that for one-fourth of the city's population that are on public assistance, the poorest areas of the city—and I represent one of those areas—there is no channeling of funds directly into those areas to compensate for the tremendous problems that they have. In fact, the Youth Board had a formula for summer programs that I think the Board of Education chose to allocate strictly on a per capita basis instead of leaving the allocation to go to the poorest areas as it has in the past.

So I am concerned about how we are handling funds, and I would like for you to be more specific. Did we, upon receiving more Federal funds as the result of adjustment, have a pull-out of city funds?

Mr. QUINONES. I think you raised issues both on the State level, as well as on the municipal level.

Let me say that, as of last year, the amounts of money that we received from the State, or that were allocated by the State, in terms of education for the city amounted to just about 30 percent. Recognize that just on the basis of numbers, our school system represents 34 to 35 percent of all of the students in the State of New York, so that just in terms of proportion, we did not and have not been receiving the due amount.

Beyond that, just as I have indicated here, we do have 81 percent of the limited English proficient students in our schools of all of the schools in New York State. More to the point that you raised, we have presented our budget, and the Board of Education is now reviewing it—but the Chancellor's budget, as it was presented by December 15, indicated that we have a need of $477 million more for this next academic year. We will be pressing aggressively before the municipal government for those moneys to be addressing the very issues that I raised here this morning.

Mr. OWENS. So you say you have indicated the need, but you have no commitment?

Mr. QUINONES. That is right.

Mr. OWENS. Mrs. Christen, may I ask you a couple of questions?

First, could you be a little more specific about the number of students who go to college? What is that percentage for a school like this?

Mrs. CHRISTEN. About 80 percent of our students go immediately into college.

Mr. OWENS. About 80 percent.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. About 80 percent. The 20 percent who do not go immediately have no difficulty for the most part finding positions in the business community. And we are finding, as I had thought we would, that a number of them go to college after 1 year or 2 years, because they very often take positions with concerns which pay their tuition. They will go with one of the investment houses or one of the banks or one of the insurance companies who pay their tuition for part-time attendance in college.

It just hasn't been long enough yet for us to get a total ultimate figure there because our first class graduated in 1978. But I would suspect that the figure is between 85 to 90 percent. Incidentally, 75 percent, I believe, is the figure across the board for the city; is it not, Chancellor? Seventy-five percent of all the graduates of the city high schools go on to some form of higher education. Of course, that varies from one school to another, but in a school such as this, it would——

Mr. OWENS. Seventy-five percent of all graduates go on to higher education?

Mrs. CHRISTEN. All high school graduates in New York City.

Mr. OWENS. Thank you very much. That is a statistic that I have never heard before.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. It is a statistic that astonishes my surburban friends, but it is a very real one.

Mr. OWENS. You mean, after the high dropout rate, those who do remain actually go into higher education?

Mrs. CHRISTEN. That is right.

Mr. OWENS. Thank you very much.

Could you give us for the record a few more details about the costs of a school like this, the costs of your computer program and your business education program? Again, I think that our perception of what it costs for education lags behind our recognition of what other areas of business and defense, et cetera, cost. Your computer program, for instance, how old is the equipment? Just what is the gap between the state-of-the-art equipment and the equipment that you are training the youngsters on, and what kind of expenditures would be necessary to update it and for technicians to maintain it? You said earlier that that is one big problem, the maintenance of the equipment and the technicians needed. Tell us for the record a little bit about of what is involved.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. All right. Let me separate it into two parts, the instructional program and equipment.

We receive no additional funds for the management of our instructional program, no extra funds, no more funds other than those which any city high school would get. All of the high schools receive their funding on an across-the-board formula basis which takes into consideration the unique nature of each school. So we do not receive extra monies for the management of our instructional program.

The cost of equipment is something else. But because we are an educational option school, the investment in equipment is in business education. We have no shops, we have no woodworking shops,

no home economics program. We have a minimal music program, a minimal band, that sort of thing. The cost of the equipment is extremely expensive.

When we opened in 1975, the board of education provided us with an IBM System III computer which costs at that time approximately a quarter of a million dollars, and we began at that time also with about nine rooms of electric typewriters. We were a brand new school, and this was fine equipment at the time.

The replacement of those typewriters has become a very, very serious problem. We have students in our school now—we have classes in which as many as 10 or 12 students are unable to type because the equipment is so badly worn by now that, even with constant repair, it is constantly going out of service. The cost of maintenance contracts is extremely high. It is up now to about $70,000 or $80,000 a year for all of the equipment that we have in the school. It is now, to a large degree, borne by the Board of Education. They have assumed the costs of maintenance. But this year, so many schools have so much equipment to maintain that I think they are funding about one-third of the total cost of repairs. The other two-thirds comes out either from the instructional budget if we are allowed to convert funds to carry the service contracts. If we are not allowed convert funds to carry the service contracts, then either the teachers themselves repair what they can or it goes unrepaired. And there are many situations in this city in which equipment is not being used because it is not repaired and we do not have the funds to do so.

The cost of new equipment is prohibitive. Our IBM diplay writers cost about $50,000 each. The computers, the Tandy 1000 computers that we are getting, probably cost about $1,000 each. I am not sure, but I think that is the number that was being talked about. But that has been coming through Federal funding.

We are still teaching computer science using keypunch machines, and that is becoming a very negative element. For a few years there, we felt strongly that there were enough companies out there still using keypunch machines and that it was justified. Now we justify it on the basis on the fact that the kids learn to program, they learn the basics of the language, they learn to do everything that you have to do using the keypunch and then, when they get out into industry, they can transfer their skills, and indeed they do. But things would be so much better if we had up-to-date equipment and they could really learn right here. They have learned a great deal here, and their motivation and their skills are high, so they do make the transfer. But it is nowhere near so good as if we had the stuff to start with.

Mr. OWENS. Thank you very much.

No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have two questions for Chancellor Quinones, one which requires a brief answer, and two for Mrs. Christen.

The first question is that I notice in your statement you mentioned—which I think is commendable—the record that you were able to achieve here in New York City. And out of the 300 Westinghouse college scholarship finalists of our Nation, 101 or one-third,

or more than one-third, are from New York City. But you mentioned also that only 19 were from the 110 high schools.

My question is: Can you give me a description of the socioeconomic districts from which these 19 students came?

Mr. QUINONES. They run the gamut.

Let me also say that that becomes rather difficult, without evading your question, because schools such as Murry Bergtraum and the Bronx High School of Science and some of the others draw from a very wide geographical area. So those schools are not just from the immediate locale.

However, let me cite a number of schools that do come to mind. Newtown High School is a neighborhood high school in Queens. It had six Westinghouse semifinalists. Reflecting the gamut, it is probably one of the best integrated schools in all of the United States, having Korean, Vietnamese, Colombian, Hispanic students, black students. You name it, and that school does have it.

One student, a handicapped student from Frances Louise High School, is, I believe, the first handicapped student in all of the United States winning a prize. We have a student who has been in this country less than 4 years being a Westinghouse winner.

What I am saying is that if you were to look at—by the way, Mayor Koch is hosting all of the Westinghouse semifinalists at Gracie Mansion this evening—you will find that that group of youngsters represents a cross-section of our students, possibly with a higher representation—not possibly, but with a higher representation of Asiatic students.

Mr. HAYES. And blacks?

Mr. QUINONES. And blacks, and Hispanics.

Mr. HAYES. All right.

You raised what is a very critical problem which I share, and it is very important, youth unemployment which adds to the whole dropout ratio. You point out the lack of hope and opportunity for employment being contributing factors. My specific question is—you mentioned subsidizing employment, the Federal Government should begin to give consideration to that—are you prepared to elaborate on what you mean by subsidizing employment?

Mr. QUINONES. Yes. We have initiated a program in New York City—I would add, by the way, by saying that we have a cooperative education program in our high schools where last year we had 17,000 youngsters employed. Those youngsters go to school for 2 weeks, and then they are employed full-time for 2 weeks in the major companies of this city. The attendance and the retention rate of that program is close to 95 percent. It is extremely successful.

What it really reflects is that many of our youngsters drop out for a variety of reasons, and one of them is economic. We have poor students attending our schools. More to your issue is that there has been a program where companies have been partially subsidized for the number of youngsters whom they hire. This makes it even more appealing for those companies who at times may be somewhat reluctant not only to hire young people, but to hire young people from minority groups where they have traditionally not done so before.

Mr. HAYES. Being more specific, could you see the possibility of some of the programs that were put into effect during the Roosevelt era and updated by our own Congressman Hawkins here and the late Senator Hubert Humphrey as being an aid to the reduction in some of the unemployment problems that we face?

Mr. QUINONES. If we go back to the days of yesteryear, we certainly had the CCC, the Civilian Conservation Corps. We certainly know that there are more than enough projects in terms of the environment that need attending to. We recognize what that program did in terms of espirit and self-discipline, as well as in becoming contributors to the betterment of the environment of this country. That is just one.

We indicated the need for just the improvement of our school system, of our physical plants, and what that could do to employment in the immediate neighborhood for those subcontractors and contractors who want to get a foot ahead and for the opportunity that that could provide in terms of our young people having opportunities for apprenticeships with them.

Mr. HAYES. Mrs. Christen, you mentioned your summer remedial program. Could you see, even with the suggested changes that you make, an end to this kind of program once you propose budgetary constraints and reductions that the administration is now coming forth with?

Mrs. CHRISTEN. I think, actually, that is a question that Mr. Quinones could answer more effectively than I.

I certainly see it as being one of the areas that the board might consider having to cut. I don't know whether they are or not, but it is an extra program which could very easily come under the ax if funds are cut, yes. And if it were cut, it would be very sad indeed.

Mr. HAYES. You mentioned something about the lack of high school teachers available here in New York City.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. I am sorry?

Mr. HAYES. The lack of available teachers here in New York City.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. All right.

Mr. HAYES. You said there were none available, as I understood you.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. That is right.

Mr. HAYES. Would you be in favor of federally enacted beginning salary levels for teachers?

Mrs. CHRISTEN. I believe I would be. I would be in favor of anything that is going to up the salary level and attract the kind of people to teaching that we need. I don't know what the difficulties would be, but I certainly would favor something of that sort.

Mr. HAYES. Just one final comment. I think that, if I understood the statistics that are contained in your statement, two-thirds of the students that enter into this high school are either at or above the grade level; is that right? Twenty-five percent——

Mrs. CHRISTEN. Seventy-five percent, actually.

Mr. HAYES. Three-quarters then.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. Three-quarters of them.

Mr. HAYES. This, I think, is a contributing factor to that great number you say enter into institutions of higher learning. Do you think it would be a contributing factor?

Mrs. CHRISTEN. It certainly is a contributing factor, but that is the distribution of at, on and above grade level students across the city—quite close to it, at any rate. And remember that the number of students, the percentage of students, city-wide who enter higher education is 75 percent. That is pretty high. I think that is marvelous testimony to the effectiveness of these schools of the city, even with the difficulties that they have with regard to resources.

Mr. HAYES. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Biaggi.

Mr. BIAGGI. Very briefly, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Christen, what is the class size in the school? Did you say something about 20 in a class?

Mrs. CHRISTEN. No. By contract and by fiat now, class size in the—the great majority of classes, almost all classes now, is at a maximum of 34. That is very large. The remedial classes 15 and 20, and thank God for them.

Mr. BIAGGI. What is an ideal size?

Mrs. CHRISTEN. An ideal size is about 25 for a normal class.

Mr. BIAGGI. Actually, I am setting the groundwork up for——

Mrs. CHRISTEN. You are setting me up?

Mr. BIAGGI. I am using you to zing into my good friend, Mr. Quinones.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. Oh, dear, I am not that close to retirement, Mr. Biaggi.

Mr. BIAGGI. Well, you are the innocent bystander.

Mr. QUINONES. We have a ricochet.

Mr. BIAGGI. Chancellor, there are plans to close a school up in Co-op City. I am told that one of the reasons is the class size is about 20 or thereabouts. We are looking for an ideal situation. We have two schools up there and one of them has an ideal situation, and we are told that it is underpopulated because it has smaller classes. I thought that was our objective.

Mr. QUINONES. You are quite right.

By the way, notice that here we are talking about high schools where we are imposing a maximum of 34. We have overall, whether it is elementary, middle or senior high schools, the largest ratio of students to teachers in all of New York State.

More to your point, I don't know of any school—and I am not saying that that might not be so—that is earmarked for closing in the north Bronx or anywhere else in the city. We don't envision—I don't envision closing any school because the needs both—you take district 10 in the Bronx. It is severely overcrowded and sorely in the need of space. District 6 in Manhattan, the needs of special education are still ones that need more space than an average class.

Mr. BIAGGI. Can I make you an ally to keep the school open?

Mr. QUINONES. I can give you a guarantee that we will not be closing a school and giving it over to anybody. We may have to have more shared facilities in terms of some of these programs, but in no way do we——

Mr. BIAGGI. We made progress. We made considerable progress. I am going to hold you to that guarantee.

Mr. QUINONES. Absolutely.

Mr. BIAGGI. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Chancellor and Mrs. Christen, for your testimony. I think the questions indicate how well a job you actually did. We appreciate your presentations, thank you.

Mr. QUINONES. Thank you all very much.

Mrs. CHRISTEN. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

Chairman HAWKINS. The next panel will consist of Ms. Maida Townsend, president of the Vermont National Education Association; Thomas E. Harvey, president of the Maine Teachers Association; and Ms. Edith Fulton, president of the New Jersey Education Association.

We will call on the witnesses in the manner in which they were listed. Ms. Townsend, we will hear from you. Ms. Townsend is President of the Vermont Education Association.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, may I have a brief word?

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Jeffords.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I want to welcome you here, Maida. I just arrived myself. Of course, one of the reasons I came is knowing you would be here. I wanted to hear your testimony. I also know that you just led a very successful demonstration in the State Capital of Vermont. I think you had some 2,000 people appear. I think that that kind of interest demonstrates the problems that a rural State is having, as well as some of the urban areas, in facing the problems of education. You have been an outstanding leader of our teachers, and I know they are all proud of you for being there Saturday, and I am very proud of you for being here today. Welcome to the committee.

Ms. TOWNSEND. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Ms. Townsend said some very fine remarks about you also yesterday, Mr. Jeffords.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Wonderful.

Chairman HAWKINS. Which I was privileged to hear.

STATEMENT OF MAIDA TOWNSEND, PRESIDENT, VERMONT NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Ms. TOWNSEND. I was just about to say we are very proud of you, too, Congressman.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the panel, I am Maida Townsend, president of Vermont NEA. As such, I represent 5,900 public classroom teachers and education support personnel in Vermont. As such, as Congressman Jeffords has made mention of, I come to you fresh from a demonstration, unprecedented in its magnitude, in support of a major boost in State aid to education as well as relief for the overburdened local property taxpayer.

The 2,000 taxpayers, parents, educators, and children gathered in Montpelier represented those who had to deal firsthand with the results of our State's not doing its fair share for public education, the results of our Federal Government's not doing its fair share for public education. The fact is that as Federal funds have shrunk and as our State's contribution through general State aid has hovered around the 25 percent mark—this, by the way, despite an increase in 1982 in both our sales and income taxes for the purpose of education—the local property taxpayer in Vermont has been asked to pickup well over 60 percent of the cost of public education.

The historic commitment of Vermont's taxpayers has been impressive, with impressive results. We have managed to retain average per-pupil expenditures equivalent to the national average. This year Vermont students achieved the second highest average SAT scores in the Nation. Vermont had the fifth lowest high school dropout rate in the Nation. Hazen Union High School in Hardwick, VT was chosen as one of the outstanding secondary schools in the Nation.

Yet, despite Vermonters' historic support for our schools, very clear danger signals cropped up as we entered the current school year. And I would share those with you briefly to set a context.

In West Rutland, VT, the school budget went to a fourth vote. There was a 30-percent turnover in the teaching staff, and classes began a week late.

In Colchester, VT, the school budget went to a third vote. Elementary music and art were cut, as were four department chairpersons, and a new math/science position was eliminated.

In Springfield, VT, the school budget went to a third vote. The budget passed was less than the budget for 1983–84, which was established at the budget level of 1982–83. District funds for supplies, books and equipment were cut approximately 28 percent. Eliminated were an elementary physical education position, the high school woodworking program, the positions of audio-visual director and reading director for the district, two elementary schools were closed and, at any one time, at the beginning of the school year in Springfield, over 200 elementary students were on an asphalt playground.

In Milton, VT, the school budget again went to a third vote. Cut was one-half of the entire elementary program in art, music, library and physical education. Also lost at the elementary level were one-half of the nursing services and two special education aides. One elementary school was closed. In the high school, gone were one home economics position, one and a half industrial arts positions, one physical education position, one library position, and one-half of a nursing position. All junior high intramural sports were eliminated, as were the hockey and gymnastics programs. Eleven teaching positions were still unfilled 1 week before school was due to open.

The Vermont taxpayer is being literally bled dry by a lack of genuine partnership among local, State, and Federal Governments. And we of Vermont NEA dread the consequences if relief is not forthcoming, and soon. In Montpelier we have asked that the needed reform be addressed, and we have proposed legislation designed to implement such reform. We ask two things of the Federal Government here today.

We ask that the so-called federally supported programs be funded at a minimum at the 1980 funding levels, adjusted for inflation. This would require a Federal education budget of $22 billion, not the $15.5 billion suggested by the administration. We in Vermont heartily support programs such as handicapped education, vocational education, bilingual education, chapter 1 education. But without that genuine tri-partite partnership, those programs will operate on a shoestring at best, with equal educational opportunity for all of Vermont's children endangered. Bilingual programs in

Vermont's northern tier have simply disappeared; 50 percent of our students eligible for chapter 1 services are not being served; since 1983, 52 special education mainstream personnel have not been funded from other than local level, if there—not to mention the legal and legislative quagmires which have developed over services for the learning disabled and residential placement. We are not asking for a handout. We are simply asking for the Federal Government to do its fair share.

Our second request is that progressive public education initiatives be addressed by the Federal Government. We were most pleased when the mathematics/science measure was passed, but given the needs, that legislation was only a first step, and not even that if the appropriate funding is not maintained. Vermont's share is to be cut by half if the administration's proposed budget is adopted.

We ask that you look beyond such initial steps. We ask that you give the utmost consideration to the kind of Federal support outlined in the American Defense Education Act. In terms of both dollars and method of distribution, the American Defense Education Act contains many components which are attractive to Vermont educators. It provides a voluntary program for local districts based on incentives for improving quality of instruction in key disciplines such as mathematics, science, foreign languages, technology and guidance. It provides local assessment of needs, followed by local development of and evaluation of improvement programs. It provides ensured participation in such local responsibility by not only all elements of each local educational community, but also of the larger community—parents, business, industry. It provides that the Federal dollars to support improvement plans would supplement, not supplant, existing moneys, and that such dollars would flow directly from the Federal level to the local level with a minimum of redtape and paper shuffling. And those dollars would not be insubstantial. Vermont alone could, in 1 year, receive approximately 4.5 million new Federal education dollars, with the total bill nationwide being approximately $2 billion in the first year and essentially double that amount in subsequent years. It is by no means inexpensive, but we in Vermont believe our children are worth it, and we franky need the help and we ask for it.

One further word. We are certainly not ignorant of the Federal deficit, nor would we want that deficit ignored. Priorities are skewed, however, if even with such a deficit, military spending can increase while public education funding is cut. Something is seriously amiss if we can literally be holding bake sales to support education programs while the military can apparently afford $700 toilet seats. For us in Vermont NEA, there is no acceptable explanation for public education to receive less than its fair share, whether that be from the Federal level or the State level.

With 90 percent of our children being educated in public schools, it cannot reasonably be denied that Vermont's strength—that every State's strength—indeed the Nation's strength—depends upon ensuring equal educational opportunity and equal access to education for every child. For the Federal Government or the State government to continue to say, "We just can't do it; you folks at the local level will just have to keep on doing the best you can,"

that, in our mind, would be not only incredible, but frankly unconscionable.

Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Ms. Townsend.

The next witness is Thomas E. Harvey, president of the Maine Teachers Association.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS E. HARVEY, PRESIDENT, MAINE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HARVEY. Chairman Hawkins and members of the Committee on Education and Labor, as president of the National Education Association's State affiliate in Maine, I am pleased to testify on behalf of the 14,500 members. Our membership is composed of all types of public school employees from kindergarten through graduate school at the university.

In preparing my testimony, I consulted several sources: Maine's commissioner of education, the Governor's advisors, university personnel, the citizen's report of Representatives to the U.S. Congress John McKernan's and Olympia Snowe's advisory committee, and my own personal experiences as a junior high school mathematics teacher for 14 years. I have also worked as an adult education instructor, summer school instructor and adjunct instructor at the university. During the past 3 years, I have served on various task forces dealing with educational reform in Maine.

In regards to the effectiveness of ongoing Federal programs at the elementary and secondary levels, Maine has three lessons learned from previous experience. And I would emphasize this is for Maine and not necessarily the world. The Federal Government should work with State government in delivering programs directly to the local level. The Federal Government should specify the goals and outcomes for a program, but not the procedures used. And the Federal Government must provide adequate and timely funding of mandated programs.

The block grant approach to funding programs is a good solution to the first concern. In Maine we have enacted and funded several new programs such as innovative grants for the classroom, early childhood education, basic school approval, student assessment, high school standards for graduation, and a newly revised teacher certification law. As school districts define particular local needs, the State can initially provide the funds and resources necessary to effectively and efficiently enact the programs. The block grant money from the Federal level, directed by the State, guarantees an equitable distribution throughout Maine. All school districts will have the opportunity to share the resources, as opposed to only those with grant writers obtaining funds. This is particularly essential for a rural State like Maine. The State's funneling of the block grants provides for the elimination of overlapping requests and the enhancement of the State funds.

The second concern of overregulation can best be illustrated by the migrant education program. Educating children of migrant workers in Maine is a seasonal venture. Maine's climate and size do not allow for year-round employment, whereas in California a migrant worker might never leave the State. The Federal role

should be, and it is, to provide the goal and allow the State to define the specific process that will be implemented to meet the needs of the children. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been consolidated from 28 specific programs into one block grant with a specific goal. This has enabled a greater flexibility which has targeted funds to special local needs. Thus, these funds have become an integral part of the educational plan in Maine.

The lack of stable funding has caused major tension at the State and local levels. This has been exemplified by the Education for All Handicapped Act passed in 1975. The Federal funds committed to this Act have only met the full need for its initial 2 years. Since that time, the State and local resources have had to be diverted to cover the education of the handicapped. Not that that is not important. It is very important. That is why we have diverted the funds. On a similar note, the entitlement formula should be based on recent costs, not 2- or 3-year-old figures. The present funding levels are, therefore, neither adequate or timely.

Given these three lessons, specific programs sponsored by the Federal Government are meeting basic objectives. The migrant education program is reaching a good number of students in Maine, but not all. Bilingual education is a growing program, with now 31 dialects being spoken in the State of Maine and having to be addressed in our public schools. Public Law 94-142 is operating and providing access to new programs, but not total access. Chapter 1 is delivering services to many of Maine's students, but not all who are in need. Vocational education at the secondary level has expanded, but not to the degrees they must. Realistically, these programs are being made to suffer from budgetary restraints. The lack of increases to combat inflation alone have caused a decrease in the programs we were once achieving.

The municipalities in Maine have reached a saturation point regarding property taxes. A statistic you may not know, although we are 41st in per-capita income, we are 11th in the ratio of per-capita income to property taxes paid. This year the State increased its share of education costs to 55 percent of the total cost of education. A recommendation to raise the State portion to 60 percent is in the legislative process now, and it is strongly being supported. This significant commitment is to fund the Education Reform Act of 1984. A fear exists that much of the increased revenues that the State of Maine has committed will be absorbed by the demands of the traditionally funded Federal programs which have been cut by inflation costs without the reality of the proposed further cuts in the name of combating the deficit. Thus, in Maine, the reform movement is placed in extreme jeopardy.

The high value of the school nutrition program can never be accurately measured. In Maine many families depend upon the program to supply the major meal of each day to the children. Several breakfast programs are also conducted and those programs were growing. My 15-year-old daughter and my 12-year-old son both receive free hot lunch. The school district serving my children educates approximately 600 K-12 students. Since 85 percent of those students qualify for free or reduced meals, the local district subsidizes the remaining children so that no discrimination is fostered.

A cutback in this program would destroy a long tradition and leave the majority of children hungry in our town.

I teach in a community where there are 40,000 in population, in a junior high school. It used to have a bagged lunch program. Because of the importance of feeding children so they can learn, we at the local level have built a cafeteria. If those special funds are reduced, that cafeteria will again be empty and we will return to the bagged lunch concept. Frankly speaking, as a classroom teacher, I have yet to find a way to combat growling stomachs in trying to teach mathematics.

The inadequate funding of Public Law 94-142 has already caused obvious tensions within the education budgets of Maine's communities. In many cases, these costs have forced taxpayers to make King Solomon's choice of cutting the baby in half, and only partially fund special education and the general operation of the schools. Thus neither program operates effectively.

A rural State relies heavily on agrarian and industrial economies. Vocational education is the open door to a productive career for many Maine pupils. The public has consistently voted bond issues for vocational education in Maine. However, the most recent vote was very close, indicating we have gone to the well one too many times. Maine has just lost $2 million in Federal subsidy this year to postsecondary vocational education via supplemental programs. This will surely affect the secondary programs in our high schools.

It will take significant dollars to fund existing programs at appropriate levels, dollars which are not expansions of programs, only a preservation of the present. If the Federal Government were to expand to new programs, I would suggest a few areas, such as a linkage between vocational education and a handicapped education program. Passage of the American Defense Education Act mirrors many of the provisions of Maine's new Education Reform Act. The ADEA would provide the necessary supplement to State resources to guarantee success in improving education in Maine's schools. It also requires an evaluation process which will prove valuable to the local, State and national agencies as we progress forward.

I would add that it would also give the opportunity to address a newly identified concern in Maine, and that is students' aspirations. In our agrarian and industrial economies, our students have long looked to the lumber industry and to the paper mills as a place to go to work. Those places no longer are going to be existing for our students, as automation takes over and we enter the informational society. We have newly identified student aspirations as an extreme problem. We must address that concern.

I dare say to you, gentlemen, that if we spent as much money advertising about the good of public education during the Superbowl as we advertised to be what you could be in the armed services, then public education would be served very, very well.

I would caution against any actions that would be called improving K-12 at the expense, however, of postsecondary education. These two spheres are not mutually exclusive.

I would say to you that any reduction in student guaranteed loans, the Pell Grants Program, will lead to one very serious shortage of K-12 teachers capable of performing the job. I sit before you

as an example of one who would not have entered the classroom had I not had the national defense student loan program. I would not have been lured from IBM to go to work in the public school classroom. My wife would not have been lured from her occupation to support public education by being a school committee person of seven years now.

In summary, I would suggest that Maine's No. 1 need for education is money. If the Federal Government meets its full obligation in the areas of migrant, bilingual, handicapped and vocational education, school nutrition and chapter 1, then the first step would be taken. The second step would be to fund a national experiment encouraging local creative, such as H.R. 650. The State and local governments would then be able to take the third essential step of improving public education by improving employee compensation. Our country could then be proud of the sound investment we had made in our democracy's foundation, public education.

Thank you.

Chairman. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Harvey.

Our next witness is Ms. Fulton, president of the New Jersey Education Association.

STATEMENT OF EDITHE A. FULTON, PRESIDENT, NEW JERSEY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Ms. FULTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Edithe Fulton, president of the New Jersey Education Association, and I thank you for the opportunity to appear here today.

You have asked for comment on the effectiveness of ongoing Federal elementary and secondary education programs in my State. I have to tell you that I consider them minimal. Federal funds contribute only a small percentage of the outlay for public education in New Jersey. Federal programs are as effective as anyone could expect, but they are narrow in scope and we need more help.

If I could just insert for a minute some of the things we have done in the State, and then get to a particular point.

Over the past few years, we have upgraded high school standards for our students. We have also toughened teacher preparation programs in our colleges. We have in place an alternate route to the classroom for those people who are in jobs and think that perhaps they might like to teach. We have an alternate route for them to join the public classrooms. We have a pilot master teacher program. We have alternate setting legislation for disruptive students. We have strengthened our bilingual programs. We have established an academy for the advancement of teaching and management. And we are heading now toward a minimum salary bill supported by the State legislature and the Governor of $18,500.

Also in this year's Governor's message, there is $30 million there for the minimum salary. He is fully funding the equalization aid to schools this year, and also proposed a 100 top scholars program and also maxigrants for current practioners of $15,000 for about 30 people to qualify for.

So, I add that to show you that we do have a commitment for education in the State of New Jersey. But just how far can we go alone? All reports that I hear indicate that we are not going to get

more school dollars from the Federal Government. If there is change, it is likely to be in the wrong direction. Obviously, budget freezes or cuts would be harmful.

From government I expect expenditures that help people to eat, survive illness, build health, work for a living, qualify for better jobs, enjoy their lives, secure justice, travel efficiently, and live safely. These goals require services rather than hardware. Funds invested in education achieve many of these goals. Federal aid to education should be increased, not cut.

Let me fantasize about what education might be like if the Federal Government nourished the public schools in the same manner as, say, the military.

No. 1, we would be proud and not antagonistic to having a U.S. Department of Education.

No 2, with legislation like the proposed American Defense Education Act, we would give that Department the mission of improving, through incentives, public schooling nationwide by doing the following things: helping to raise teacher salaries significantly to assure continued quality in the instructional force; by reducing class size to enhance individual student achievement; improving course offerings in such fields as mathematics, science, new technologies, vocational education, and communications to strengthen industry, the national defense, and the earning power of our graduates; and by providing necessary equipment and hardware for laboratories and computer courses.

We could do this if the White House would consider stockpiling a few hundred less bombers, canceling a few hundred tanks, getting by with a few hundred less missiles, and cutting back on aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines—in short, if we were able to be satisfied with an adequate defense rather than an offensive capability that a peace-loving nation doesn't need.

I would like to stress one area in which the Federal aid should be significantly increased to help the public schools, especially in the big cities—in New Jersey, such older urban areas as Newark, Jersey City, Paterson, Camden, Trenton, Elizabeth, Ashbury Park. These cities' school systems need help, and the need is severe, and the opportunity for results immense.

I realize that many of our governmental leaders resist giving aid to city schools. How many times have I heard a legislator say, it's throwing money down the drain.

Recent research findings give the lie to such pessimistic assertions. The children in our poorest urban schools have the same innate capacity as children in the richest surburbs. What they need is an appropriate opportunity. We now know many of the ingredients that constitute that appropriate opportunity. This knowledge comes from the effective schools movement.

I need not recite the effective schools principles in this company. But I will report that in New Jersey, in training programs that NJEA has been conducting since 1980, we have been trying to develop the five that we consider most crucial. These are, No. 1, a schoolwide emphasis on the basic skills; No. 2, a disciplined school environment; No. 3, the expectation that students will perform and succeed to the limits of their ability; No. 4, careful teacher monitor-

ing of student progress; and No. 5, supportive leadership from school administrators.

Just let me give you a little background. NJEA is a professional association with 117,000 members, 83,000 of whom are certified professionals such as teachers and counselors. Many of our members work in urban schools.

Back in 1979, our urban education committee, working in cooperation with the nonprofit Research for Better Schools Agency of Philadelphia, developed the training package for schools in urban areas. Our goal is to boost staff confidence and morale and establish common goals while building commitment and skill in the education of urban children.

We call our training curriculum NJEA school effectiveness training. We have successfully given SET training in such places as Jersey City, Paterson, Camden, Atlantic City, and Plainfield. We invite all members of the school community to participate—parents, support staff, administrators, and school board members, as well as teachers.

In New Jersey, two legislators have introduced acts to appropriate funds for spreading the effective schools movement in our State. There are Assemblywoman Mildred Barry Garvin of East Orange and State Senator Gerald R. Stockman of Trenton.

The NJEA supports both these bills and, as we commend you, Chairman Hawkins, for your sponsorship of H.R. 747. We also salute our State legislators for addressing the crucial educational issues of our time.

The job to be done in our cities is immense, and immensely important. The NJEA will do all we can, but our efforts are inevitably limited. The State must step in to expand and spread the movement.

And the Federal Government should be doing more. We heartily endorse the Effective Schools Development Act and support your efforts to get it enacted so that Uncle Sam can do his share in meeting the greatest educational challenge of our time, developing to their full potential the skills, abilities, and potential of our least advantaged children.

Thank you for this opportunity to state my views and discuss the policies of the teaching profession in New Jersey.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Ms. Fulton.

I assume that assembly bill 1860, introduced by Assemblywoman Garvin is the bill referred to in your prepared statement; is it not?

Ms. FULTON. Yes; there are two. Senator Stockman's bill actually has been moving faster than Assemblywoman Garvin's. However, I think the two have been amended to be somewhat compatible. They are now at a $500,000 limit, although there is an amendment to increase it to $1 million, and we are hoping that the $1 million funding is the one that will pass.

Chairman HAWKINS. I see. Thank you.

Mr. Harvey, in your statement, you indicated that Maine has just lost $2 million due to the postsecondary guidelines. Will you elaborate on that?

Mr. HARVEY. It is my understanding that under the supplemental programs of postsecondary and vocational education, Maine programs have been declared no longer supplementary and, by that

definition, $2 million of money that we were using for faculty members and facilities can no longer be used from Federal funding.

Mr. HARVEY. The State at this point is raising approximately $600,000 to meet some of those needs, but obviously the rest of that will result in cuts at our six vocational technical institutes statewide.

Chairman HAWKINS. Is that due to a change in the law or to a guideline that has recently been issued?

Mr. HARVEY. It's my understanding it's a guideline that's recently been issued and enforcement is coming down the line.

Chairman HAWKINS. We will check on that to clarify.

You also said on page 4 that a cutback—that's in the School Lunch Program—a cutback in this program would destroy long tradition and leave the majority of children hungry in our town.

Would you elaborate on that, and in what way would that cutback take effect? You previously had said that 85 percent qualify for the free or the reduced meals. Then are you saying that a cutback in the program itself would leave the free and reduced lunch children without the program at all, or what really are you saying?

Mr. HARVEY. I really believe, Mr. Chairman, that what will occur in that particular community is that the desire to subsidize the program at the local level will be eroded enough for it not to occur any longer. With that loss of local subsidy, coupled with the loss of Federal subsidy, the quality of that program will be drastically reduced.

The lady who runs the school nutrition program in that particular school district has told me that her feeling is it will be time to retire because she won't be able to take pride in the kind of meal that she has put out. She has also indicated to me that she truly believes that she is delivering the No. 1 major meal, and to at least 400 of the 600 students, and it is of a good quality nature at this point. With the reductions in the program they will not get the seconds that they are presently getting. They won't even be getting the firsts that they are presently getting.

Chairman HAWKINS. The administration has given the impression that all they are doing is requiring those who can afford to pay for the meal, to pay for it, and that this in no way then would seriously affect the other children who depend on the program. I assume from what you say, you disagree with that.

Mr. HARVEY. It is not my disagreement, Mr. Chairman, as much as it is Ms. Howard's disagreement. She has been told what the differences will be and what she receives in Buckfield, ME. And it has indicated to her that it is below the levels that the Federal Government is providing that goes to the 85 percent and, in fact, her meals would be of a lesser quality than the ones that she is presently serving, and disregarding the local subsidy.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Jeffords?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I want to say that we welcome Congressman McKernan on our committee now, and I know he has a deep interest in education and will do an excellent job. And, second, my sister is a teacher in Maine so I will be keeping watch on you as well as the Maine system.

I want to just point out to the committee that we have here two of the poorest States when you come to per capita income. If you adjust per capita income for regional differences in Maine and Vermont, they are almost the poorest in the per capita income category of any States—so we share that dubious distinction.

I would also just like to point out here as has been mentioned, that when we talk about budget deficits we are really in part 3 of the President's program. One was to decrease taxes, which has resulted in a loss of over a $100 billion in revenue. Two, was to build up our defense which has added about $100 billion to our budget. And the third phase was to redefine the Federal role in our social programs with an eye toward reducing the Federal role. So, we are seeing this $200 billion hammer being used to bring about this social reform. And it is important for us to all realize that.

My question involves what the ramifications of the full impact of some of the things that have been suggested would be, and I am eyeing primarily upon the ability of the States to fund their education. I notice Maine has fairly substantially improved, but in Vermont we rely very heavily on the property tax.

Under the administration's program, we would have in effect a real cut in education due to a freeze-type situation. Second, they would eliminate revenue sharing, which was passed originally to alleviate some of the problems with raising money for education in the local communities.

And, third, under their tax reform they would no longer allow for the deduction of property taxes on your income tax return or the State taxes.

I wonder if you have given any consideration to what the full impact would be of all of those suggestions, especially on Vermont, knowing the difficulties you are having now in getting the State to increase and the fact that I am going to have to embarrassedly say, we are one of two States in the Nation that appears to be having a deficit situation right now.

What would the impact be by all of those things?

Ms. TOWNSEND. Quite simply put, it would be crippling. The amount of money coming into Vermont from the Federal level——

Mr. JEFFORDS. And from the people from New Jersey, I would add, I would like to commend the other part of our panel for sending so many people up to leave their money in Vermont and go home, we appreciate that very much. Thank you. [Laughter]

Ms. TOWNSEND. But to the point, frankly, small amounts of Federal dollars which currently are coming into the State, be it through revenue sharing or direct education funding, if those were to become even fewer, as I said, the effect would be crippling. And this is not by any stretch of the imagination to say that the State does not bear its own responsibilities with finding a way to not only increase its support of education. Again, we are at only approximately 25 percent in Vermont as far as State support of education goes. And we are bringing pressure to bear within the State, not only for implementing reform of our tax structure—for instance, looking at a statewide kind of property tax whereby commercial, industrial and second home properties would be taxed at rates much higher than forest farms and primary homes. But we also are pressing for the implementation of a revenue sharing pro-

gram within the State. But all of that is in its very initial stages and before we are able to have all of that implemented, if the Federal support is yet further cut back—we are already between the proverbial rock and the hard place—I ask, you know, are we going to have even more Springfields, West Rutlands, Miltons and the rest.

The taxpayers in Vermont simply cannot deal with it anymore, and they are literally being asked to choose between a good, solid education system—and there is solid support for good, solid education, sound support for our children in Vermont—and simply being able to make ends meet, pay their bills. That is a choice which more and more Vermonters are finding just totally untenable, which brings me back to the point which we started here today, the demonstration in Montpelier last Saturday, to try and effect a meaningful change.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you.

Either of the other members would like to comment on the total impact of the proposals at the Federal level?

Mr. HARVEY. In Maine it has been recognized that we have been placed in a situation where although we have just recently allocated another 10 percent of the present spending level in Maine to new programs in the special session for education reform, we have added another $50 million to the coffers to improve education with an anticipated plan of that increasing to $90 million over the next 3 years.

It is now being suggested that that per chance equals the exact impact of all of the Federal cuts that are being suggested in revenue sharing and the other programs, social programs, outside of the educational package. And everyone is clearly, at this point, producing budgets that are to be going to hearings, town meetings, in March of this year, and the first of April of this year, hedging their bets.

I think Mr. Owens described the situation clearly when he said, what's going to happen if we send you more moneys, if there are no protections, won't the municipalities just steal the money away from the education budget and put it someplace else? Clearly, that is an idea that is in the back of some people's minds.

The Maine legislature is making the statement that they are putting in the bills for added funds that there must be a maintenance of effort at the local level before the additional revenues above the normal State funding formula will be allocated to those various townships and municipalities.

But right now it's being stated in Maine that the amount that we are raising for new movements in education are in fact matching the amounts being suggested to be got.

Ms. FULTON. Even in New Jersey, which probably would be considered in much better fiscal condition than either Maine or Vermont, and many of our other New England neighbors, but in truth, in New Jersey, we are, I think, are second in dependence upon the local property tax to fund our schools.

So in essence, it doesn't give our taxpayer any relief even though the economy of the State appears to be very good. We are in second in per pupil expenditure in the Nation. We are third, I think, in per capita income. So perhaps you say people can afford to pay

that. But it is only 43 percent of the State budget. Our money comes from the State to fund our schools. And it is the only budget, perhaps so in other States, that the public can vote on each and every year. They don't vote on the national budget in person, nor the State budget, nor the county budget, nor the municipal budget. But they get out and they are allowed to vote on the school budget. They take out their frustrations in the other areas on us.

The first place the State looks, or the town council looks, or the county looks, to save some money is in the area of education.

Now, we were very fortunate in the Governor's message that the State budget was yielding an admitted $600 million surplus. We figure if they admit to 600 million, it has got to be closer to a billion. Yet, the impact upon the Federal cuts that we have been able to garner so far would add up to almost $800 million of losses to the State of New Jersey, not just in education but in total cutbacks at the Federal level, and a good part of it in education.

So that we see almost two steps forward and five steps backward if the Federal Government does not keep its commitment to at least the funding levels that we have had, let alone any proposed cuts.

So I think no matter whether our States—and we work very closely with the New England States. We are in a region together with New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the New England States, so we do understand each other's problems. But we don't think that the impact is any less favorable to us than it is to Maine or Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Biaggi?

Mr. BIAGGI. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Owens?

Mr. OWENS. Just one quick question to Ms. Townsend.

You indicated that this unprecedented huge gathering in Montpelier had parents, teachers——

Ms. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. OWENS [continuing]. All people related to the educational world. Were the businessmen, military people, professionals, were they not interested at all, or did you just pass them up and not invite them?

Ms. TOWNSEND. It was open to anyone who wished to be there to make a statement on behalf of the need for more funding for education. It is very interesting that you bring that apparent dichotomy forward.

I don't believe that there was a great representation of the business community or the military community there. It was parents, taxpayers in general who do or do not have children in the schools, as well as representatives of all of the education community. But I did not see anyone there in uniform.

Mr. OWENS. Thank you.

No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions. I just wanted to make a comment that I have benefited from the well prepared statements that the panelists have supported with excellent testimony here. I will study and scrutinize those statements and im-

prove my efforts as one Congressman to enhance the survival of the public educational system which Mr. Harvey referred to, I think properly, as the democracy's foundation. Thank you very much.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Harvey, the $2 million loss was explained to the Chair by the fact that the new Vocational Education Act did limit funding to new programs and not to improving the existing programs. The House bill would have continued the law's provision for maintaining local programs; however, the Senate bill did not, and that provision was repealed. So it is true that as a result of the conference, that the present situation is that the moneys must go to new programs rather than to improving existing ones. I assume that's the explanation and clarification of that $2 million loss.

Mr. HARVEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. That is true, I understand, in several other States as well.

Mr. HARVEY. It is just another example, I believe, sir, that the State has the best idea how to define what the needs are. And to put those kinds of restrictions on only hurts each State as it tries to deal with its operation.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you.

We wish to thank the witnesses, Ms. Townsend, Mr. Harvey, and Ms. Fulton for very excellent presentation. Thank you.

Ms. TOWNSEND. Thank you.

Mr. HARVEY. Thank you.

Ms. FULTON. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. The next panel will consist of Mr. Thomas Hobart, president of New York State United Teachers, and Mr. David Sherman, assistant to the president, United Federation of Teachers.

Mr. Hobart and Mr. Sherman, we welcome you to the hearing and we look forward to your testimony.

Mr. Hobart, let us have your testimony first and then Mr. Sherman, and then we will address questions to the two of you. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS Y. HOBART, JR., PRESIDENT, NEW YORK STATE UNITED TEACHERS

Mr. HOBART. All right, thank you very much. I am Tom Hobart, president of the New York State United Teachers, and I am a vice president of the American Federation of Teachers, which is affiliated with the AFL–CIO.

In New York State we represent 250,000 members in the elementary, secondary, and higher education as well as members in the health care and the professional employees of the State of New York.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to share with you our concerns and some of the vital educational issues facing us today.

From the outset, the Reagan administration has made clear its intention to reshape and reduce the Federal role in American education through changes in policy and significant budget reductions.

The public schools have already suffered severely from Federal budget cuts.

In addition to these, 700,000 needy children lost Medicaid protection; child nutrition programs were cut 27 percent, and 2 million children losing free or reduced-price breakfasts or lunches, and more than 700,000 children from middle income families lost the opportunity for low-interest and higher education loans.

Now the public schools and the college students are faced with more budget cuts. Reagan's program for the next 4 years may prove even more severe than its first term. It is obvious that he has the same agenda: reduce Federal elementary and secondary programs, reduce aid for postsecondary students and implement a tuition tax credit or voucher program for attendance at private schools. NYSUT and AFT will not condone such actions—we adamantly reject them.

When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was passed, it was recognized by the Federal Government that a segment of our population—namely, the economically and educationally disadvantaged student—was in need, and had a right to, special services.

Since then it has been well documented that remedial math, reading, and writing skills, together with various support services, will enable these youngsters to realize educational success and to become productive citizens. Certainly the proud success of our affirmative action programs of the last decade would not have benefited such a wide range of citizens without the federally sponsored compensatory education program.

A report of the National Institute of Education stated that, "In general the results were encouraging about the effectiveness of compensatory educational instructional programs."

Although these programs have proven to be effective, they continue to be underfunded. Each year eligible students go without services. Because of inadequate funding, eligible students in high schools generally are not served. The situation is exacerbated by the increased number of children living in poverty. In 1970, 16 percent of those under age 14 lived in poverty compared to 23 percent in 1982. We need additional support, not further reductions.

And we need it concentrated for compensatory programs primarily in our urban areas rather than being basic aid to all districts as they block grants to States now mandated.

The plight of children of migrant workers is nationally known and it is a problem which is often neglected at the State and local level. The Federal Government responded to the needs of our handicapped children, but again, inadequate funding has forced the burden of paying for those services on States and local school districts.

The non-English speaking students and the children of the migrants of our country need special services. These are national concerns and the costs should not be borne by the States.

Migration into New York State continues to play a major role in New York's demographics. New York State has been a major place for settlement from all over the world throughout its history and remains so today. Only California received more foreign immigrants during the 1975–80 period.

Many immigrants face serious economic hardships and it behooves the Nation to meet the challenge of providing training and educational opportunities to enable these immigrants to become productive citizens.

The President's recommended budget cuts in the various elementary and secondary programs show lack of foresight and vision. The premise that Federal aid losses can be assumed by State and local governments is a perfect example of the naivete of the Reagan administration's policies.

Another case to illustrate the problem is early childhood education. As the movement toward education reform forges ahead, the United Teachers and the AFT firmly believes that the expansion of early childhood educational opportunities should become a high priority on the national agenda.

NYSUT and the AFT have been strong advocates of early childhood programs for more than a decade. A policy statement adopted by the AFT executive council in December 1974 stressed the need for expanded early childhood education to be administered by the public schools. The need for such programs is as great in 1984 as it was in 1974.

The urgency for action is heightened when one considers the millions of children who have gone through our public schools without the benefit of organized education during the most critical development period of their lives.

The research available in 1974 has been replicated and expanded during the past decade, and even more compelling results are there today.

There has been a great deal of publicity given to the study begun in Ypsilanti, MI, two decades ago. This longitudinal study attempted to analyze the effect of preschool education on a group of young people—half of whom were enrolled in an experimental and federally funded Head Start Program in the Perry Preschool and half in a control group which did not receive any preschool education.

The results demonstrate graphically the benefits which are enjoyed by students who received preschool training.

Sixty-seven percent of the young people who attended preschool graduated from high school while only 49 percent from the control group graduated.

Thirty-eight percent of the preschool group had gone on to some form of postsecondary training, compared with only 21 percent of those children who did not attend preschool.

And 61 percent of the preschool group received average or above average scores on functional competency tests while only 38 percent of the control group scored this high.

Differences between the groups could also be found in areas related to social behavior. The rates of detentions and arrests, incidence of teenage pregnancies and number of welfare recipients were all significantly lower among the preschool group.

This study demonstrates a tremendous educational benefit which is enjoyed by children attending an organized preschool program. This and the reduced need for more expensive social services later on in life is a cost-effective way to spend Federal funds.

If a true commitment to those programs were developed on a nationwide scale, America could have taken a giant step toward helping its young people achieve their potential.

The college student did not escape the first round of budget cuts. Social Security aid to students was eliminated and changes in the Pell grants were made. Now Reagan is proposing a $2.3 billion reduction. As a result, it is estimated that 5.3 million current students will be affected, and it is expected that 574,000 middle-income students will lose their eligibility for Pell grants.

The President's budget proposal also requests a reduction in the Pell grants by $100. In addition, there is a proposal to cap student loan eligibility at the adjusted gross family income of $32,500—thus over 1 million current borrowers from the Guaranteed Student Loan Program will be ineligible.

The Federal Student Aid Program was implemented in order to assist needy youngsters in their quest to become well-educated and productive citizens.

In 1960, before these aids were available, 398,000 students went to college in New York State; in 1983, 999,000 students attended colleges in New York State.

These proposed budget cuts will return America to a day when only the children of the wealthy had appropriate educational opportunities.

These proposed cuts further emphasize the failure on the part of the Reagan administration to recognize that education is an investment in the future of the individual and in the future of the Nation.

Another example is the vital issue to public education is the impact of Federal incentives to abandon the public schools. Such legislation, if passed, will do incalculable damage to the country's public schools. Tax credits will provide a high tax subsidy to private and religious elementary and second schools.

The intent of such legislation, if not outright hostile to public schools, is at least neutral in an exodus from the public schools and a preference for nonpublic education. This will lead to a large drain on the Federal Treasury as more and more private school parents apply for the tax credits, and more and more entrepreneurs go into the school business.

Public schools will be left very poor—those who could not afford private education, even with the subsidy, and those who are rejected on academic discipline or other grounds by the private schools.

Two hundred years ago our Nation established the proposition that basic education for every person is both a public good and an individual right. The proper educational business of the State at the elementary and secondary level is to make sure that every child has available in the public schools an excellent education, an education which will develop the child's potential to the fullest. That is why we pay taxes. But while a parent should have a choice, if a parent chooses to place a child in a private school, for whatever reason, there should be no obligation on the part of the Government to finance that choice.

If we subsidize the expense of sending some children to private or parochial schools, who will pay the bill? The cost of sending students to private schools will be borne by those people who are sup-

porting the public schools—in some cases, people who will never have a choice. Tax credits and voucher systems would be devastating to our schools. Public education has made our country great; it has provided a common bond which holds a diverse people together.

There is another proposal which we feel must be stopped, namely, the President's proposal to eliminate State and local taxes, including school taxes as a deduction from Federal income tax.

Adoption of this proposal would strike hardest at States like New York which have recognized their responsibilities to provide vital services to their citizens.

Education, health, and welfare programs, repair of the infrastructure and development of mass transit systems all have required a vast commitment of State tax dollars. Deducting these taxes on a Federal return has eased the burden greatly. Eliminating this deduction would make payments of State and local taxes an almost intolerable burden and would make further expansion of vital services extremely difficult.

As we proceed with efforts to bring about increased funding for educational excellence, removal of this tax deduction would create a major obstacle in gaining any increase in State or local levies.

The biggest financial support that the Federal Government has provided for public education has not been its programmatic aid but the many billions of dollars more it provides by making these taxes deductible from personal income subject to Federal taxes.

It is not easy to get taxpayers at the State and local level to pay for public schools and it will be even more difficult without the deduction. Paying Federal taxes on dollars already used to pay State and local taxes is unfair and illogical.

The President's plan would cost the taxpayers approximately $16.5 billion in increased educational costs. This represents approximately $1 billion more than President Reagan requested in his fiscal year 1986 education budget. Such a plan to eliminate Federal tax deductions may very well rekindle the tax limitation movement which resulted in Proposition 13 in California. If this plan is enacted we will see the end of educational reform in our Nation.

And on New York City in particular, there are some statistics I think you should know. Programs for the poor have borned a disproportionate share of Federal cuts. Domestic spending was cut by $37 billion in 1985, and with the exception of Social Security and Medicare, a $31.3 billion cut is slated for non-defense spending in 1986.

The President's budget proposal would reduce Federal revenues to this city and its residents by $1.2 billion. The loss of deduction which will cost New York State an estimated $6.5 billion. New York State's loss to education loan is estimated at $2.1 billion. Currently, the combined taxes paid by New York City families earning $50,000 exceeds those amounts paid by families in other cities by as much as $3,221.

Since 1981, the Federal support for the city and its residents has been reduced by almost $20 billion. Under the President's proposal, Federal aid for New York City would continue to decline as a percent of the budget. Funds which have been unrestricted and/or

flexible are to be reduced substantially. General revenue sharing is to be eliminated as well as a reduction in community development funds and a sharp reduction in the funds for CETA, JTPA programs.

The elimination of $270 million in general revenue sharing for New York City is equivalent to the salaries of 7,000 teachers.

In addition to these cuts and the impact of eliminating the tax deduction, the President is also proposing massive cuts to New York City for its housing, development, jobs, transportation, and health programs. It is just too much for any State or any city to bear. The Federal Government should play a vital role in emphasizing standards, providing for remedial programs, enhancing professional opportunities for teachers, providing financial aid to the needy students in a sensitive and responsible manner.

As we suggested earlier, we believe that early childhood education should be on the national agenda. We would place a high priority on funding the existing Talented Teachers Act and we would also urge the passage of a bill which has been introduced by Congressman Pat Williams which would provide compensatory educational services in high schools—a problem which I highlighted earlier.

We believe that not only is it appropriate, but necessary, for the Federal Government to undertake new initiatives in dealing with common problems such as dropouts, drug and alcohol abuse, impact on technological changes, et cetera.

It is not possible for even a developing country to contemplate economic advancement without a commitment to educating its citizens, much less a great and complex country like our United States with its vast technological needs, its economic sophistication, et cetera.

Each State will provide for education not just for its own business needs, but for the national needs, and even the needs of other States as its citizens freely migrate across the country.

Education always has been, and always will continue to be, an investment in the future of our Nation. Education of Americans is an American concern, and the NYSUT and the AFT hope to see an American commitment from our Federal Government to true educational excellence.

Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Hobart.

Mr. David Sherman, assistant to the President of the United Federation of Teachers.

STATEMENT OF DAVID SHERMAN, ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, UNITED FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

Mr. SHERMAN. I would like to welcome Chairman Hawkins, Mr. Hayes and Mr. Jeffords to New York City, and tell two of my Congressmen, Mr. Owens and Mr. Biaggi, it is nice to have you home for this hearing, and I am glad to have this opportunity to address all of you this morning.

As the adage goes, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." In 1965, President Johnson and Congress initiated the War on Poverty because

an overwhelming need was recognized and major initiatives were undertaken at that time to fulfill the Federal commitment.

These programs, most particularly Title I, as it was called at the time, worked then and they work now—we have volumes of testimony, both in research and in increased student achievement in this city and elsewhere, that they are working today. We now have too many people who are advocating major changes in what should be done with this, and this is something which I certainly don't see any reason to go about and change.

We all know what the Federal role in education is—to protect and support those children who have been historically unserved or underserved; to provide equality of opportunity and equal access for those less fortunate, and to do so regardless of race, color, creed or family income. The need has not changed, and nor should the Federal role in meeting it.

Contrary to recommendations of the President and groups like the Heritage Foundation, we do not need to change the Federal role in education. We need to affirm it, over and over again. We have accomplished much, but the job is hardly finished.

When times were flush such as in the early Carter years, we would appear before Congress and talk about "unmet need"—those students who were left out because of insufficient funds.

Now the President tells us we are protected by a "freeze" on Federal education funds. Obviously, that's a lot of nonsense, because a freeze only is translated into a cut in service. And do you know, Mr. President, that there still is an unmet need?—those thousands of children in New York City, which is, you know, the Nation's largest school district, for whom there never has been and still is not enough money to provide for the full complement of services which they need and require.

Everyone wants to see the deficit reduced, but freezing programs like Chapter 1, vocational education, Headstart, is not the answer. What's worse—a budget deficit or an intelligence deficit? In the long run, will we really save Federal funds if we fail to rescue as many children as we can from lives of poverty, illiteracy and dependency?

We do not need a new Federal role in education. We must adapt, continue and expand the original role to meet the needs of the 1980's and beyond. Congress must insure several things:

Congress must insure that children have the best possible teachers. In addition to individual State initiatives, both in this State and others which have been mentioned this morning, it would be very helpful if adequate funding were provided for the Talented Teachers Act so we would have a complementary Federal initiative, not only in legislation but also enacted and backed with appropriate funds. It would certainly help some of the things that we have been doing in New York State already.

Congress must also insure that children are protected and supported in the early years. There is no need to go on at length—many of the speakers have referred to the means and evidence that early childhood education and pre-kindergarten education in particular, have been successful.

And because of that I am convinced that the best dropout prevention program is a solid and enriched early childhood education.

I really don't think there's any question about that. Just ask any fourth grade teacher, third grade teacher in this city, or anywhere, who the potential dropouts in his or her classes are. With amazing accuracy, they know them, and they are usually absolutely right.

On the subject of Federal initiatives with young children as well as other children, let's also at this time just mention support for the School Facilities Child Care Act, or the Latchkey Act, which was passed last year, and would really help to address the increasing problem in the 1980's of single parent families and, you know, children coming home to find no one there.

Congress must further insure that children have incentives to keep them in school. Opportunities for intensive and innovative remediation in basic skills, work/study and job incentives must be available. On a broader scale, a Federal effort on school effectiveness, such as that proposed by Chairman Hawkins last year, would promote the number of schools, based on successful models, which have true holding power. We look forward to working on this as well as a comprehensive measure to combat high school dropouts.

Each of these becomes meaningless if Congress cannot ensure one more thing, and that is that children have schools. If the proposed cuts in basic services for urban areas are adopted, there will be drastic cuts for education in our city's schools. To us in New York City, the survival of our essential services: education, housing, transportation, medical care, among others, is one and the same.

Congress cannot kill our basic support systems and expect the schools to survive on their own. In this city, the schools budget is part of the city budget, and if Federal cuts attack the city's basic services, they attack education as well.

Before I leave the topic of the Federal budget, I must comment on the proposed tax reform measure, the impact of eliminating deductibility of State and local taxes. Although I know that this committee does not have tax jurisdiction, I must mention the problems we will all face if this deduction is lost. The greatest losses will be for taxpayers in those States with higher levels of public services, more progressive tax structures, high income levels and a greater commitment to the public schools.

Many of the States with the highest potential losses for public education are right in this region: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. In terms of per pupil losses, the States most harmed would be New York, ($588 per pupil) New Jersey ($586 per pupil) and Maryland ($541 per pupil). The negative impact of the loss of deductibility of State and local taxes would be felt on school budgets and State legislative initiatives.

In essence, adoption of a measure of this kind would virtually cripple the education reform movement throughout the Nation. With the progress we have made, and we are just at the beginning, this would really be intolerable.

Moving on to more local concerns, I would like to begin with some thoughts on the largest Federal program for elementary and secondary schools, of course Chapter 1.

In New York City, there are few, if any, Federal programs which have been as successful and have had as positive an impact on student achievement as this one. Reading and math scores of our stu-

dents have recently surpassed national norms, and this is something which surely never would have happened without the important and consistent help we have had from Chapter 1.

I would like to thank this committee for its continuing support for this program, but I don't want you to think that you are really off the hook, because our students' accomplishments thus far are just a glimmer of what they could be if this program were adequately funded and we had all of the students who needed these services receiving them.

Instead of a freeze, we need a significant increase in Chapter 1 funding. There is also a critical need to target compensatory education funds on the high school level, as many of the speakers this morning have mentioned.

We certainly support the bill introduced by Congressman Williams in this regard, and urge the committee's prompt action on it.

In terms of dropout prevention and entry into the job market or into higher education, it is critical that economically disadvantaged students receive remediation which they require while they are still in high school. We consistently hear from businesses and universities that they are unduly burdened with providing for remediation, and they are right. On this bill I strongly recommend that schools' staff have significant input into the design of these programs in their schools.

Many critics have said that compensatory education programs have never worked as well on the secondary level as they have on the elementary school level. Well, who better than teachers and other school staff could design these programs if given appropriate flexibility and input? I would make that a specific recommendation for Congressman Williams' bill.

One more recommendation on the Chapter 1 program, namely, the reintroduction of concentration grants which were eliminated several years ago. These should be restored as part of any additional Chapter 1 appropriation. This program was particularly well targeted because it allocated extra compensatory education funds to the most poverty-intense school districts.

Concentration grants are a simple way, already on the books, to drive additional support to students of greatest need. They need it and they deserve it.

Moving from Chapter 1 to Chapter 2, let me share with the committee some of the effects of the block grant on New York City. We went from total funding of antecedent programs of over $21 million to $11 million in Chapter 2 funds. This pattern was repeated in cities all over the country.

Some of the finest innovative educational programs in our city resulted from many of those antecedent programs. For example, an in particular, Emergency School Aid Act programs, including the Magnet Schools, were particularly successful in this city in terms of promoting further integration where possible, and by providing educationally exciting schools.

With the advent of the block grant and the severe cut in funds, many of these efforts could not continue. Now that Congress, in its wisdom, has restored the Magnet Schools Program, the President's recommendation to eliminate funding for this program must be shot down.

If chapter 2 is here to stay, there should be an effort to bring its appropriation level up to the total of the antecedent programs, translated into 1985 dollars. Students need the educationally stimulating and innovative programs which chapter 2 could provide.

Currently, all we are getting is some limited funding which forces States and school districts to fight over which programs to save and which programs to eliminate.

I would like to add that for 3 years I have served on these States' advisory commission on chapter 2. And it has taken about 3 years to bring all of the groups in the State together to come up with a very productive approach to dealing with the Chapter 2 Program, because at the beginning all we were doing was fighting. We were fighting with each other when in fact we had to come to the realization is that we were dealing not with problems with each other but the fact that we had an enormous cut in funds.

Two brief comments on two other existing programs. One is on the Bilingual Education Program, and for the sake of brevity, all I would like to say is that there really needs to be additional flexibility provided in the regulations for that program. This city, where we have over 20 languages, and provided for a bilingual education, are obviously looking to increased flexibility, is something which would be helpful.

The other is the education of all handicapped children, which certainly is landmark legislation and remains one of the most pronounced examples of mandates without money. Appropriations have never approached the legislative intent and they have really left school districts straddled with the financial responsibility to provide for the services. And what usually happens is we have to cut from other services which we also have a responsibility to provide.

Congress passed Public Law 94-142, and we certainly support it, but it must be supported with appropriations which do provide for its many mandates.

These are just some of the directions in which we must go. The Federal role in education has been significant and successful in meeting the needs of our students, particularly the disadvantaged. We must build on our successes, in some of the ways I have mentioned, and not be diverted by those who advocate proposals for tuition tax credits and voucher schemes, which, in their manifest inequity, would only serve to destroy one of our Nation's greatest accomplishments: a free public education system. It made our country and will continue to if we stay on course and intensify our efforts in the right direction. With our support, I urge this committee to do so.

Mr. OWENS [presiding]. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Sherman and Mr. Hobart, you realize the problems quite well and have made some excellent proposals. I just have one question or comment, it has to do with a great deal of applause for your leader, Mr. Shanker, in his new role as a statesman who did have contact with the White House.

Is there any possibility that some of these cuts are going to be negotiated? Are there negotiations on the way or being proposed by such groups as your union, behind the scenes to help ameliorate some of this harsh position?

Mr. HOBART. Well, that's an emphatic yes. But since a year ago, there has been a national election taking place and I am not sure how much will be listened to in the White House. We are very hopeful that in the Congress, though, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and we will have a more receptive ear, and that the President will begin to see the light and the error of his ways.

I know Congressman Jeffords spoke about the social revolution that we were having here from the President's budget. Really what he is proposing is the Federal Government should be removed from the education business, and that certainly can be characterized as a change in our social commitment, but the wrong change.

I think that Congress has a role to insure that States do right, whether they are enlightened or not enlightened. We saw that that was necessary with integration—Congress had to come in and insure that States were going to do what was correct. And in the educating of our children, I think Congress is going to have to maintain that role also.

Mr. OWENS. Thank you.

Mr. Jeffords?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you.

I am glad you again pointed out what we have going on here—I think it is important to keep our eye on what is going on, and it is not just a budget fight, it's a philosophical fight.

In talking about philosophy, I wonder if you could help me understand the administration—this is probably not the way to go but, anyway, let me try it.

Do you find that there is a philosophical inconsistency with starting a new program up with an income level of eligibility of some $60,000 to entice or help people send their kids to private schools in the primary and secondary? And on the other hand, limiting to a little over 30,000 the eligibility of kids to go to college, and limiting their choice to below-average-cost State institutions?

Mr. HOBART. I think you have stated it well, Congressman. I don't see the consistency, even in the fact that they don't relate directly. We certainly should be looking for those families that can't send their children to higher education, and be willing to help them in some way, because that is really a resource for us in the future. Certainly we must take care of job training for those that are going to go into our work force. But how much important for those to go to college will be the ones that develop the cure for cancer and the new economic theories that will carry us through other times.

The second problem I am dealing with—aid to either vouchers or tuition tax credits. With this budget deficit, I can't imagine why the President still supports that program, even if we were able to balance the budget, which I don't think he is going to be able to do, there is a strong social reason not to be for tuition tax credits. Our schools are our melting pots. Certainly parents have a right to a choice. And I think that makes our country great. But not an encouragement to leave the institution that is really going to take care of the concerns of America.

So I agree with your statement. I think they are very inconsistent.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Let me just go on to express a little bit of the concern for this is for high school students as well as college students. In the hearings we just had in Vermont on the Higher Education Act and the fundamental changes that are being asked in that, as to whether or not you believe that this creates a tremendous amount of instability in what our young people, especially high school seniors, are having in trying—and after they have gone through 2 or 3 years trying—to figure out what college to go to, to suddenly find that they are going to be limited to below-average-cost State institutions.

Do you think that that's a critical problem which we ought to try and deal with in the short time that we have?

Mr. HOBART. I think the most critical need is to provide the educational opportunity for the student. And whether they are going to achieve that in a public institution or a private institution, certainly they should have a choice.

I think the problem is deeper than that. You are going to have those families who today, with the help of the Federal Government and their own savings, are able to have a full choice, from among the private or the public institutions. Once we take away the Federal dollars, that choice becomes limited. If they have the children that have had the most opportunities, the ones that have been able to travel and have hard cover books and extra types of lessons in their home, their children will be able to be the ones that are admitted to the public institutions, and who is going to be dropped out. Those are going to be the families that need the help the most.

So it is far more critical than just the choice between public and private. It is going to have a chilling effect on all higher education. And as the predictions are for the future, even at the current level of aid from the Federal Government is to have less people in college, will have even more restriction on those that are going to go to college in the future without these loans.

Now, if you take $32,000, and you take off what is already the tax obligation of the individual, and you allow not for luxury items but for just the maintenance of what is necessary in this society, you really don't have the $12,000 or $15,000 that a private school is going to demand.

If you also don't have what a public institution is going to demand—if we just look at the cost of housing, if we look at the cost of food, of travel, of books, of some social life for the individuals that are going through school, we are just totally cutting off the opportunity for many capable Americans that would make a valuable contribution to our society.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Biaggi.

Mr. BIAGGI. Thank you both for very comprehensive statements. Truly, your comments are like taking coals to Newcastle. The fact of the matter is, Congress has been responsible for all of the programs that have developed over the years. Mr. Sherman said, in the good Carter years, when we had moneys available and we kept appropriating more moneys, it was a little different.

Even a freeze at this point is equivalent to a cut, as you have said. We know that. I have said it before and I will say it again, it is not a universal freeze, it is elective—it is hitting right into social

programs that have been effective. They have been effective, they have been critical in the development of a natural resource, and to dismantle it at this point performs an absolute disservice. And to reduce the funding, they are doing by indirection what they couldn't do directly. And the fact of the matter is, we in the Congress—and I have served on this committee some 14 years now—take a very dim view of the administration's attempt to emasculate, if not completely eliminate programs that we have created, and have gratified in the fact they have been very productive.

I don't know about the negotiations between the administration and your organizations. You made a very salient observation in the intervening period—there was in the last election. And I am not so sure your group is so endeared by its position, although you are not alone.

But the fact of the matter is—a practical assessment, Congress will not accept the President's budget—that is as clear as night following day. There will be some improvements and we will see to it that we will try to recover as much as we can. We have done it before—in some areas better than others. But we have been able to resist, or at least have moderated the President's initial offer, and I am confident we will do it this time.

Just one question, Mr. Hobart. I think you made reference to it—If there is a $270 million cut in Federal revenue sharing, there would be a loss of 7,000 teachers' positions?

Mr. HOBART. That's right. That's just figured at the inadequate salary that is paid here. But that is how it is going to break out.

Mr. BIAGGI. Based on the salaries paid here—they are inadequate. I have spoke up on that issue time and time again, and it's disgraceful. It is clearly disgraceful, and it should be adjusted. How it will be—it should be a tripod-type situation. It should work out, but it's just disgraceful. And how the teachers can do it—it must be a great calling, obviously, teaching is a calling.

Mr. HOBART. Well, the effects are being felt. State University at Albany last year graduated one-half of all the certified physics teachers for the State of New York. Now, our own graduates are the ones we qualify to teach in our schools. The number of graduates at Albany last year was one. We certified two physics teachers in the State last year. And we are going to have to do something to correct that if we are going to be able to train future scientists and future mathematicians that are going to be able to drive this economy.

Mr. BIAGGI. The legislation we passed in the last Congress with relation to math and science; is that helpful?

Mr. HOBART. Yes; it's all helpful. But we are going to have in the Nation almost 300,000 openings in the coming year. In New York State, it's going to be about 10 percent of that—and New York is about 10 percent. And we don't have those people to fill the roles.

We are going to have to fight very hard to make sure the standards are not relaxed because we want people at least as qualified as who we have in service, and we might need a more qualified for the technological teaching that is going to be required in the future.

Mr. BIAGGI. So clearly, under the present system, we won't even be able to meet that 30,000 shortage in those areas?

47-501 O—85—3

Mr. HOBART. That's right.

Mr. BIAGGI. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Hayes?

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, thank you. My consciousness of the time constraints which we are operating within and my desire to hear the remaining witnesses, complicated by New York's traffic immobility at certain hours, I am going to refrain from raising any questions. I will study the testimony with interest and if I have any questions that I want to ask, I will be glad to reduce it to writing and submit it to the panelists. Thank you very much.

Mr. OWENS. Thank you, gentlemen, very much.

Our next panel consists of Dr. Stephanie Robinson, associate director of education and career development of the National Urban League; Dr. Juan Rosario, national executive director of ASPIRA of America, Inc., and Dr. Thomas K. Minter, dean of the division of professional studies at Lehman College-CUNY.

Is Dr. Minter here? Dr. Minter is not here. Ms. Robinson, will you begin, and Mr. Rosario following. We will ask questions after the two of you have completed your testimony.

STATEMENT OF STEPHANIE ROBINSON, PH.D., EDUCATION DIRECTOR, NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE, INC.

Dr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, on behalf of the National Urban League and our president, Mr. John Jacob, I am pleased to have the opportunity to come before you to discuss education, which is an Urban League priority in the program area.

As you may already know, but by way of a brief introduction, the National Urban League is a social service, civil rights organization, whose mission is to work for the improvement of the lives of blacks and other minorities.

One hundred and thirteen affiliates in 37 States offer a range of educational activities ranging from advocacy to direct services.

In fiscal year 1984, affiliates expanded over $7 million on education related programming.

Professional staff provide child care services, advocate for adequate school budgets and speak out on local education issues. The national staff provide technical assistance in program development, management, and evaluation.

Mr. Chairman, the National Urban League reaffirms its support of this country's experiment with universal public education. Although there are serious problems, especially with respect to meeting the needs of minority students, the following is also true according to the National Education Association:

In 1980, 85 percent of white students graduated from high school as did 75 percent of black students as compared with just 50 percent of white students and 25 percent of black students 30 years earlier.

The median educational level of blacks has been increased from eighth grade in 1960 to twelfth grade in 1980.

Low-income students have increased their reading and math scores.

And disadvantaged students in Chapter 1 Programs have improved their reading skills.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time also, I am going to kind of skip by—I am not going to read this whole thing.

Mr. OWENS. Your entire statement will be entered into the record regardless.

Dr. ROBINSON. I am going to skip over because you have heard much of what—and I want to add my voice to much of what has been said about the Chapter 1 program, early childhood education. But there are a few things that I do want to highlight.

At the National Urban League we feel that a Federal role is crucial to assist in making sure that the quest for educational excellence in which we unequivocally endorse, is accompanied by assurances of equities.

In a NUL paper which commemorated the *Brown* v. *Topeka* desegregation decision, we offered an expanded definition of equity which includes the concept of parity of measurable outcomes for minority students such as: reduction in dropout rates; reduction in the overrepresentation in special education classes of minority students; and improvement in the retention rates of black students in 4-year colleges, et cetera. We feel that we need an operational definition of equity that these things represent.

Much has been said about the Chapter 1 legislation and I agree, but I do want to say that the elimination of requirements for parent advisory groups in the Chapter 1 legislation when it was reenacted as part of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, has considerably reduced the participation of minority parents in these programs according to the Children's Defense Fund, and I have cited some of that information in my testimony.

Although Chapter 1 funds were not block-granted, no longer is there a mandate for parent involvement through parent advisory councils. Where there is no mandate for the involvement of low-income and minority parents, their involvement becomes subject to the largesse of the school administrators in many cases. Parent involvement is critical and should be part of the regulatory guidance provided by the Federal Government .

While Chapter 1 service delivery can be improved upon, it will not happen unless there is a return to some of the conditions which contributed to its effectiveness. And I agree with the eloquent speakers of the past who have cited instances where Chapter 1 is working, the Title I Program has worked.

Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation Improvement Act block-granted 27 formerly categorically funded programs. I agree with the previous speaker, funds for desegregation was zeroed out when Chapter 2 was enacted. And although the legislation enabled school districts to expand Chapter 2 funds for desegregation, a study by the American Association of School Administrators indicated that the school districts that they surveyed, those school districts spent 80 percent of their funds on computer hardware in 1983-84.

According to the American Association of School Administrators, superintendents are reluctant to spend Chapter 2 moneys on programs or salaries, in many instances, because they feel that it might not continue. They don't trust the constancy of the funding.

The point about Chapter 2, because nonpublic school children are counted and weighted in the formula the same as public school children in many instances, Federal support for nonpublic schools has increased substantially.

My experience was in New Jersey in 1979—I happen to be a former school administrator in New Jersey and was intimately involved in 1979—the nonpublic school share of Federal funds under Title IVB and the transportation and textbook aids was some $450,000.

Under the formula driven block grant, that share increased to over $1 million in 1980-81. At the same time, school districts which had been implementing desegregation plans lost up to 90 percent of their funding.

Also, New Jersey had a small discretionary grant program under Chapter 2 to try to offset the shortfall. But because of the equal participation of nonpublic school students mandated in Chapter 2 regulations, the school districts that competed and won funds to support a desegregation program was compelled to share those funds with students in nonpublic and private schools in the community.

With respect to early childhood and kindergarten programs, we agree certainly with the former speakers on the efficacy of these programs and the research that has demonstrated certainly their payoffs with respect to at-risk populations.

The Perry preschool project has documented that 67 percent of preschool group graduated from high school as compared to 49 percent of the control group, and other such statistics which I have cited.

But situations exist where poor black and minority students are entering school for the first time at 5 and 6 years of age and competing educationally with other students who have had 2 to 3 years of stimulating preschool experiences. And these situations, when so-called readiness tests are given, minority students' low scores do not reflect a lack of ability; they reflect the lack of exposure to educational experiences. Unfortunately, these test results are often used as indicators of the students' innate potential for achievement. Students are then deemed incapable of performance. Little in the way of academic performance is expected and the students are thus programmed for failure at the onset of their career.

On a comment briefly on tuition tax credits and financing of public schools—the Urban League and its affiliates generally decry and deplore those funding projections or recommendations that would siphon funds from the public school system. Tuition tax credits which would provide poor families with $500 in tax credits do not appreciably improve these families' ability to purchase educational services. In fact, the proposals perpetuate a cruel hoax on such families when they purport to do so.

Vouchers for educational services are often cited as a way to provide parents with a choice of educational settings. This is a vote-with-your-feet theory. A voucher, however, for, as was stated before, for $500 for an educational tuition cost of $2,000 to $3,000 or more is no help for those people who may need or want to change schools.

I have had firsthand experience with school systems which relied heavily on choice to achieve voluntary desegregation, and these voluntary systems do not work unless there are a whole host of supportive services provided.

Vocational education: Historically, blacks and minorities have viewed vocational education with ambivalence because these programs were often used as methods to send black students into dead-end, economically unproductive occupations.

However, we feel that blacks should be accorded the full range of vocational education programs and participation. And although the projections for the vast growth in employment in the high tech industry have been overstated, we would be remiss if we allowed black and poor students to remain unaware of the opportunities that will be available in those fields.

According to the National Council on Vocational Education, black students still comprise the major population in vocational education programs that are non-technically oriented.

We are not disparaging these occupations but we simply emphasize the fact that black students should be proportionately represented in the full range of vocational programs.

We applaud the chairman's efforts in the passage of the Carl Perkins Vocational Education bill. That legislation embodies some of the provisions for equitable educational service delivery, such as targeted funds and set-asides for disadvantaged students.

We especially are pleased about the provisions for the involvement of community-based organizations, and would hope that the bill would be funded to allow participation of the community-based organizations as provided. There was a $15 million authorization for CBO participation, and we urge you to support that.

There is a critical lack of participation in math and science programs by blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans.

We cite the inequities in the allocation and use of educational technology as a great concern. Dr. Robert Fullilove, writing in the National Urban League "State of Black America", cites the "Matthew Effect" as being operative—as my grandmother would put it, "them that has gets." In other words, those that have the ability to purchase the technology get the advantages and they maintain their advantages over the disadvantaged.

We would support and urge continuation of an expansion of the math and science initiative in this effort.

We are particularly concerned about the use of computer technology and educational technology for black students, and as Dr. Fullilove points out, it is not a question of the access now so much as how computers are being used. The question is, are they used primarily for remedial drill and practice, or are they used to increase mathematical competency such as logic and functions and to computer programming in those areas.

I have also cited some model programs that speak to those issues in my testimony.

We support the chairman's efforts to operationalize the effective schools philosophy by providing funds for research and replication of this exemplary program. I have personally observed and been involved in it and can attest to its ability to provide an atmosphere and a climate which is conducive to learning.

We recommend, however, that in some way this philosophy be also included in the mainstream in teaching in the educational institutions. Student teachers should also be assigned to model schools that are operationalizing the effective schools process so that they can observe and participate in that process during their training. This would eliminate some of the unlearning of bad habits that has to occur in order for some educators to be able to implement the effective school process.

In the area of civil rights we feel that the Office of Civil Rights should be strengthened and not made weaker.

The proposed recision would further impede the ability of this office to provide the information that school districts require in order to support programs which address equity issues.

We have listed a set of recommendations on page 21. And in conclusion, I would say that we are not blind to the fact that budget deficits must be lowered. Education programs should not, however, be asked to bear a disproportionate share of the belt-tightening. The current education administration budget proposals reflect what we have called this country's intermittent response to education reform. Funding for some programs designed to impact on some of the problems identified by the reform movement have been eliminated or reduced.

The funding for magnet schools, which are designed to improve mathematics and science, and in some cases to foster and support desegregation, is slated to be cut. Magnet schools, properly implemented and monitored, can enhance learning opportunities for all students, and minority students in particular.

We urge that funds be maintained for this program. Freezing and reducing overall spending levels for education belies the administration's rhetoric regarding education and support of it.

Mr. Chairman, over 50 percent of the minority school students attend school in 12 of the 14,000 school districts in this country. These demographics have clear-cut implications for education policy and funding. Comprehensive efforts in these 12 districts can make a difference in the educational lives of a significant number of black and other minority students.

Thank you for the opportunity to come before you today.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Stephanie Robinson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF STEPHANIE ROBINSON, PH.D, EDUCATION DIRECTOR, NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE, INC.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: On behalf of the National Urban League and our President, Mr. John Jacob, I am pleased to have the opportunity to come before you to discuss education, an NUL priority. As you may know, and by way of a brief introduction, the NUL is a social service, civil rights organization whose mission is to work for the improvement of the lives of Blacks and other minorities. One hundred thirteen affiliates in 37 seen states offer a range of educational activities ranging from advocacy to direct services. In FY 1984, affiliates expended over $7,000,000 on education related programming. Professional staff provide child care services, advocate for adequate school budgets and speak out on local education issues. The national staff provide technical assistance in program development, management and evaluation.

Mr. Chairman, the National Urban League reaffirms its support of this country's experiment with universal public education. Although there are serious problems, especially with respect to meeting the needs of minority students, the following is also true according to the National Education Association:

In 1980, 85% of white students graduates from high school as did 75% of black students compared with just 50% of white students and 35% of black students 30 years earlier.

The median educational level of blacks has increased from eighth grade in 1960 to twelfth grade in 1980.

Low income students have increased their reading and math scores.

Disadvantaged students in Chapter I programs have improved their reading skills by as much as 17 percent and they have improved their abilities in math in some instances by as much as 74 percent.

Nearly 4 million hungry children were fed through federal breakfast and lunch programs in 1980-81 alone.

Title IX has made a major difference in increasing opportunities for women. (Many minority women were among the group).

Most of these hard won advances were achieved with the assistance of strong federal presence which supported the legislative efforts that resulted in programs. Subsequently, I will cite documentation which, in our opinion, demonstrates that we are experiencing a change in basic philosophy about education which has resulted in policy changes whose effect, if not halted will roll back gains cited above.

On the other hand, these advances are tempered by the problems revealed by the National Board of Inquiry, Chaired by Harold Howe, II, for the National Coalition of Advocates for Students. The Children's Defense Fund co-sponsored the study. In a series of national hearings, the Board of Inquiry heard testimony that racial discrimination remains a serious barrier to quality education.

63 percent of black students attend predominately minority schools.

Only 8.5 percent of all teachers are minorities.

Tracking and sorting policies have a resegregating effect resulting in predominately white upper level courses and predominately black lower level courses in which students experience lower self-esteem, more misconduct and higher rates of dropping out.

At high school levels, blacks are suspended three times as often as whites.

The national dropout rate for blacks is nearly twice that of whites.

In urban high schools, dropout rates have reached 80 percent for Puerto Rican students and 85 percent for Native American students.

Only one-third of the 2.7 million students with limited English receive any special help. That figure falls to 10 percent for Hispanic students.

This situation will be exacerbated if the proposed cuts in bilingual education become a reality.

In May of 1984, the NUL issued a statement to commemorate the anniversary of the Brown vs. Topeka School Desegregation Decision. We sent the Committee a copy, but I have brought along another for the record. In that statement, we acknowledge the changes in policy and education funding which have resulted in the states becoming the seats of influence and decision-making. Nevertheless, the NUL is on record as supporting a federal role in education. That role involves ensuring that all students regardless of race, gender, national origin, socioeconomic status or handicapping condition have the opportunity to realize their full academic potential. The federal role is to protect these rights. The role is even more vital now that decisionmaking about education policy and funding is even more localized.

The federal role is crucial to assist in making sure that the quest for educational excellence (which we unequivocally endorse) is accompanied by assurances of equity. In the NUL paper we offer an expanded definition of equity. This includes the concept of parity of measurable outcomes for minority students such as (1) reduction in drop out rates, (2) reduction in the over-representation in special education classes and, (3) improvement in the retention rates of black students in four-year colleges and other measurable outcomes. This is an operational definition of equity.

We were asked to comment on the impact of federal programs. The block granting or education funds and passage of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, which was part of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981, had serious repercussions for education in general and minorities in particular. Chapter I of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, (ECIA) through a budgetary action, repealed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Chapter I of the act replaces Title I of ESEA. The purpose of the act is to provide remedial assistance to educationally disadvantaged students. The new law changed the program considerable, by: Changing the statutory requirements governing the intented use and distribution of funding; eliminating the requirements for parent advisory councils; removing most of the state level monitoring and guidance requirements for the local programs; and substantially reducing the federal government's role in the program.

The Children's Defense Fund conducted a survey of the Chapter I programs and observed the following:

790,000 fewer children were served by Chapter I in 1982-83 than were served in 1979-80, a three-year decline of 15%.

High school, summer school, Math and Kindergarten Chapter I programs were virtually eliminated in 12 states. This comes at a time when the results of a Perry Preschool Project Research has presented irrefutable evidence relative to the effectiveness of early intervention programs in producing economic gains in at-risk populations of students later in their lives. It also comes at a time when the College Board has announced that the standardized test scores of minority students have shown an upward trend. This trend appeared before the current education reform movement had called for increased standards, and although the President, in the State of the Union Address, credited the reform movement with improving the test scores, it is more likely that the compensatory education programs which had been in effect were beginning to pay off. (sic, NY Times editorial Tuesday, February 5, 1985).

Parent involvement decreased dramatically in 25 states.

State monitoring and guidances was drastically reduced in 25 states.

Children's Defense Fund, *An Interim Report on the Implementation of Chapter I,* A white paper prepared by the Children's Defense Fund, Education Division.

Although Chapter I funds were not block granted, no longer is there a mandate for parent involvement through parent advisory councils. Where there is no mandate for the involvement of low income and minority parents, their involvment becomes subject to the largess of the school administration. Parent involvement is critical and should be part of the regulatory guidance provided by the federal government. While Chapter I service delivery can be improved upon, it will not happen unless there is a return to some of the conditions which contributed to its effectiveness.

Chapter II of ECIA block granted 27 formerly categorically funded programs, including support for desegregation programs. Funds for desegregation were zeroed out when ECIA was enacted. Although the legislation enabled school districts to expend Chapter II funds for desegregation, gifted education, arts education and other ESEA funded programs, a study by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) indicated that in 1983-84, the school districts they surveyed, had spent 80% of their Chapter II funds on computers.

According to AASA, superintendents are reluctant to spend Chapter II monies on programs, i.e., salaries, because they do not trust its constancy. Thus these funds are not being used to provide educational programs to students as is the legislative intent. The passage of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 was heralded as a means of simplifying the grant-making process. Block grants have resulted in less money being spread over more school districts. Because non-public school children are counted in formulae and weighted the same as public school children, in many instances, the federal support for non-public schools has increased substantially. In New Jersey, in 1979, the non-public schools' share of federal funds under Title IV B and transportation and textbook aid was some $450,000. Under the formula driven block grant, that share increased to over a million dollars in 1980-81. At the same time, school districts which had been implementing desegregation plans lost 90% of their funding. Those funds have never been recovered.

New Jersey also had a small discretionary grant program under Chapter II to try to compensate for the shortfall some of the districts were experiencing. Because of the "Equal Participation of Non-public School Students" mandate in the Chapter II regulations a school district which competed and won funds to support a desegregation program was compelled to share those funds with the students in those schools in the community. This was true even though the students in those schools were not participating in the desegregation plan, and were probably in those schools to keep from so doing. Targeting of funds through categorical aid is necessary if the educational needs of under and unserved populations are to be met.

Citizen and parent participation in the educational process helps to identify needs and assists in ensuring that these needs are met.

The fund recommends, and we concur, that the Congress should conduct ovesight hearings of ECIA and continue the clarification process which began with the passage of the ECIA Technical Amendments of 1983 enacted as Public L. 98-211.

EARLY CHILDHOOD/KINDERGARTEN

The National Urban League, in collaboration with its affiliates, has supported the implementation of early childhood and Headstart programs over the past 20 years.

At present, 11 Urban League affiliates sponsor Headstart or Title XX Early Education Centers.

Pre-school education programs are a proven strategy for creating a more equitable educational system. However, they are not generally available to those who need them most. The results of the Perry Preschool Project research revealed the following:

For every $1,000 invested in preschool education, as much as $4,000 is returned to society.

A comparison of poor blacks who received preschool education with a control group and those who did not, revealed: 67% of the preschool group graduated high school compared to 49% of the control group; 59% of the preschool group was employed as compared to 32% of the control group; 31% of the preschool group had been arrested or detained as compared to 51% of the control group; The preschool group experienced less than half of the teenage pregnancies as the control group; and 61% of the preschool group scored above average on tests of functional competency as compared to 38% of the control group.

Early childhood education reduced the need for special education or grade retention. Consider these facts in light of the fact that the Headstart Program is only reaching 18% of poor children or its eligible population.

Situations exist where black, poor and minority students are entering school for the first time at five and six years of age and competing educationally with other students who have had two or three years of stimulating pre-school experiences. In these situations, when so-called "readiness tests" are given, minority students' low scores do not reflect a lack of ability: they reflect the lack of exposure to educational experiences. Unfortunately, these test results are often used as indicators of the students' innate potential for achievement. The students are deemed incapable of performance. Little in the way of academic performance is expected and the students are thus programmed for failure at the outset of their school career.

Many school systems are contemplating serving 4-year olds. If done for the right reasons, and not to offset declining enrollments, this is a positive sign.

The bill to give credit to school systems to use their buildings for early childhood education intervention and child care programs should be given careful consideration. Having implemented such a program in a public school setting, I know that it can work. I also know that there must be collaboration between the school system and community-based organizations for it to work. As I mentioned previously, the Perry Preschool Project research documents the economic payoffs that early intervention programs produce. I recommend their research study "Changed Lives", a report of the Perry Preschool Project, Yipsilanti, MI. The development and implementation of policies which reflect this research and programs which are based on the findings (particularly with respect to low income students) would contribute to excellence, equity and the overall quality of education.

SCHOOL FINANCE

Resources should be deployed where they are needed to achieve equity of educational results for black, poor and minority students. Urban school systems serving these populations have disproportionately higher operating costs. Large city school districts have higher costs for support services, and greater needs for special services for minority, handicapped and other educationally "at risk" students.

The Children's Defense Fund and the Board of Inquiry study highlighted the following:

The quality of education a child receives is profoundly affected by the accident of whether the child lives in a low-spending or high-spending school district.

Funding varies widely among states. In 1982, New York spent $2,769 per pupil while Mississippi spent $1,685.

Funding varies widely within states as well. In Massachusetts, for example, annual per pupil spending reaches a high of $5,013 in Rowe and a low of $1,617 in Athol. This inequity is repeated in many states.

Property tax is still the primary source of funding for public education. Variations in the revenue produced through local property taxes alter the quality of education a child receives.

State aid distribution formulas have provided increased funding but have failed to increase equity. In some states, more money is actually provided to the school districts which are richer.

In equalizing effect of federal money has been decreased by recent cutbacks. Federal funds once accounted for 8% of local education cost on average, but now cover only 5%. In poor and minority areas, this can mean a loss of up to 20% in funding.

While 90% of the nation's children attend public schools, only 27% adults have children in public schools.

These results are consistent with the National Urban League's findings reported in the Equity and School Finance Colloquium, December 1982.

The NUL is opposed to financing measures which ultimately siphon funds from the support of public schools. Tuition tax credits, which would provide poor families with $500 in tax credits, do not appreciably improve those families' ability to purchase educational services. In fact, the proposals perpetrate a cruel hoax on such families when they support to do so. Millions of dollars would be diverted from public school support if tuition tax credits were to enacted. Although some local NUL affiliates have supported tuition tax credits, the official position of the National Urban League is cited above.

Vouchers for educational services are often cited as a way to provide parents with a choice of educational settings, i.e., the "vote with the feet" theory, which on the surface, seem like a good idea. However, a voucher for $500 for an educational tuition cost of $2,000-$3,000 is of no help to most of the parents who would need or want to change schools.

People who can "vote with their feet" in the manner in which these proposals purport to allow them to, usually have many resources at their disposal such as transportation. I have had first hand experience with a school system which relied heavily on choice to achieve voluntary desegregation. The only reason that situation worked for black and poor children was because transportation was provided. Voucher systems would more than likely leave black students imprisoned in increasingly inferior schools from which additional resources would have been drained.

School finance is a state/local responsibility. Many states have surplus funds that were targeted for education, but citizens want tax relief. Equity and quality are the educational issues. Tough decisions have to be made rather than proposing funding processes which drain already meager public school funds. The federal role must be to target funds for programs for at risk populations to bring parity to education funding.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The League has in the past advocated, and will continue to advocate, for quality vocational educational programs. Quality vocational education includes rigorous academic preparation as well as job skills training. Quality vocational educational programs should be based on solid information about the economy. Quality vocational education necessitates cooperative efforts between businessmen and educators. Quality vocational education teachers must understand the marketplace in which they are preparing students to function.

Historically, blacks and minorities have viewed vocational programs with ambivalence because these programs were often used as methods to send black students into "dead-end", economically unproductive occupations. Demographic figures indicate that minority populations will become an increasingly large percentage of the workforce during the late 1980s and 1990s. Currently, vocational/technical schools are preparing workers to enter growth area careers and occupations. Black, poor and minority students must have access to these programs, especially since increases in job opportunities will occur in the information processing and technical areas.

The projections for vast growth in employment in the high tech industry have been overstated. Only 6% to 8% of the new jobs will be in the area of high tech in the 1990s. However, we would be remiss if we allowed black students to remain unaware of the opportunities that will be available.

According to the National Council on Vocational Education, black students will comprise the major population in vocational education programs such as cosmetology and woodworking/auto mechanics (non-technical areas). We are not disparaging these occupations. We are simply emphasizing the fact that black students should be proportionately represented in the full range of vocational programs.

We recognize and applaud the Chairman's efforts in the passage of the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Bill. That legislation embodies provisions for equitable educational service delivery, such as targeted funds and set-asides for disadvantaged students. These are conditions that the NUL has always deemed necessary for equitable vocational educational service delivery.

We are especially pleased about the provisions for the involvement of community-based organizations. Our experience has indicated that the CBO/education/government collaboration is enhanced because CBOs can often relate to the constituency

with which the school may have difficulty communicating. The law provides for this kind of collaboration. The Appropriations Bill appears to follow the programmatic requirements for the current bill. If the special needs populations are to be served, and the community-based organizations are to participate in vocational education programming, the appropriations will have to reflect the additional authorized activities. There was a $15,000,000 authorization for CBO participation. We urge you to support a level of funding for this bill that will allow its intent with respect to CBOs to be carried out.

MATHEMATICS/SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY

We call attention to the critical lack of participation in the math/science pipeline by blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans. Research has documented the fact that blacks and Hispanics are grossly under-represented in the quantitative sciences and that they are not able to persist through the science/math pipeline into advanced degree programs in proportion to their representation in the population.[1]

The League is committed to supporting the development and implementation of strategies to increase the pool of black and other minority students who can persist successfully through the math/science educational pipeline to post-secondary and advanced degree programs. The National Urban League supports the development and implementation of activities, such as math/science after-school programs, career guidance, motivational and awareness programs to achieve these goals and urges the committee members to support the development of legislative initiatives which support such activities for minorities.

Inequities in the allocation and use of educational technology causes us great concern. The potential for there to be an ever widening gap between the technological haves and have nots is real. Dr. Robert Fullilove, writing in the NUL, *State of Black America,* cites the "Matthew Effect" as being operative with respect to the distribution of education technology resources.[2] The "Matthew Effect" holds that "for whosoever hath, to him shall be given". In other words, the privileged members of a society are the first to afford the economic costs of technology and their use of it (the technology) ultimately increases their advantages over the less privileged members of the social order. This produces a cyclical effect that increases the advantages of the advantaged.

Attempting to address this need, the Xerox Corporation donated $5,000,000 in computer hardware to the National Urban League. In response to a request for a proposal, proffered by the National Urban League, school boards submitted proposals describing computer assisted instructional programs designed to enhance writing and language arts skills. One needs to be able to communicate in order to compute. The Urban League involvement ensured that the computers were placed in the schools where the NEED was the greatest. The Urban League will monitor the programs to ensure that they remain true to their intent. Equity and excellence were mutually compatible objectives of this project which combined the resources of the private sector, the schools and a community-based organization. This project provides a model which can help to ensure equitable distribution of resources. The Federal Government could provide incentives for the implementation of such projects.

Dr. Fullilove also points out, and our experience corroborate the assumption, that it may not be so much a questions of access to computer technology for black students, as it is a question of how the computers are used. Are they primarily for remedial drill and practice; or are they used to increase mathematical competencies such as an understanding of logic, functions and sets? The latter are skills which are attained in computer science and computer programming classes.

Dr. Fullilove also cites model programs at the University of California at Berkley in which minority students consistently excell in mathematics.

We urge the Committee to support adequate funding of the Mathematics and Science initiative and to pay special attention to identifying and replicating teacher training and math/science programs which demonstrated their success with minoritiy studenst such as the Professional Development Program at the University of California at Berkley. Other successful models are available, such as those implemented by the Southeastern corsortium of Minorities in Engineering (SECME) based at the Georgia Institute of Technology.

---

[1] Berryman, Sue. "Who Shall Do Science?" Rockefeller Foundation, 1983.

[2] Lenk, Klaus. As quoted by John Lipken in a paper entitled, "Equity and Microcomputer Use in Public Education".

SCHOOL DROPOUTS

Statistics are all too readily available on the magnitude of the dropout, pushout problem among minority students. School to work transition programs, where learning job related skills is combined with academic work, are strategies which improve student retention in secondary schools. Successful programs are functioning in communities where local Urban League, the business community and the local education agency work together to identify young people who are at risk of dropping out of school and provide them with viable alternatives.

These "school to work academies" train students in areas such as electronic banking. Upon completing the program, students are eligible for better-than-entry level jobs, which the business community has pledged to provide. Foundation funds provided support for planning. The programs are designed to become institutionized and self-sufficient in three years. This is a strategy that has demonstrated success with this population. It is cost-effective and efficient. The Federal Government could provide seed money for replication of this activity on a scale large enough to impact on the problem. The causes of equity and excellence in education would be served by such programs.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

We support the Chairman's efforts to operationalize the Effective Schools philosophy by providing funds for research and replication of this exemplary program. I have personally observed the program and know that it can provide the atmosphere and climate which is conducive to learning.

The Effective Schools philosophy has to be included in the educational mainstream. In order for it to have an impact, teacher training institutions should be encouraged to include the concept in their teacher preparations courses. Student teachers should be assigned to Effective Schools so that they can observe and participate in the process. This would eliminate the unlearning of bad habits that has to occur in order for some educators to be able to implement the Effective Schools process. Incentives for these kinds of activities might be included in the authorized activities of the legislation.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Office of Civil Rights should be strengthened, not made weaker. The proposed recision would further impede the ability of that office to provide the information that school districts require in order to support programs which address equity issues. Programs cannot be monitored by any group unless certain data are available.

The Grove City decision has limited the ability of students to seek redress of discriminatory practices in educational institutions which receive federal funds. Discriminatory practices are not confined to programs which are implemented through federal funding.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Fund the Head Start Program at the authorized level ($1.2 billion dollars).

Maintain funding for the Office of Civil Rights at the 1985 level.

Develop and support legislative proposals which provide for appropriate access to and use of technology for minority students.

Pass the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1985.

Fund the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act at a level which will ensure the participation of community-based organizations, and programs for special needs groups. ($15 million dollars was authorized for CBO participation).

Implement oversight hearings on the use of Chapter II funds.

Fund the Vocational Education Bill at a level which will allow CBO participation.

CONCLUSION

We are not blind to the fact that the budget deficit must be lowered. Education programs should not be asked to bear a disproportionate share of the belt-tightening. The current administration's budget proposal reflects what we have called this country's intermittant response to education reform. Funding for programs designed to impact on some of the problems identified by recent studies have been eliminated or reduced. The funding for magnet schools, which are designed to improve mathematics and science education, and in some cities, to foster and/or support desegregation, is slated to be cut. Magnet schools properly implemented and monitored, can

enhance learning opportunities for minority students. We urge that funds be maintained for this program. Freezing and reducing overall spending levels for education belies the administration's supportive rhetoric regarding education.

Mr. Chairman, over 50% of the minority public schools students attend school in 12 of the 14,000 school districts in this country.[3] These demographics have clear cut implications for education policy and funding. Comprehensive efforts in these 12 districts can make a difference in the educational lives of a significant number of black and other minority students. Thank you for this opportunity to come before you.

Mr. OWENS. Dr. Rosario.

STATEMENT OF JUAN ROSARIO, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ASPIRA OF AMERICA, INC., NEW YORK

Mr. ROSARIO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, honorable members of the committee, Chairman Hawkins. It is an honor for me to be before the congressional Committee on Education and Labor and present testimony.

I am testifying before you on behalf of ASPIRA of America, a national Hispanic organization in which I serve as executive director. Besides a doctoral degree in education administration and education policy from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, I was assistant superintendent of schools in Newark, NJ until 1983, when I assumed my present position with ASPIRA.

Allow me also to introduce the organization I represent. ASPIRA has identified three primary goals as the focus of our mission, the development of leadership potential in Puerto Rican and other Hispanic youth.

First, to foster a commitment among Hispanic youth to dedicate their leadership skills toward the resolution of socioeconomic problems within our community.

Second, to motivate, orient and assist Hispanic youth toward their leadership, educational and intellectual development.

Third, to increase access to quality educational opportunities for Hispanic youth through advocacy programs.

ASPIRA pursues these goals through a network of services and activities at the local and national levels. At the local level, offices in Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Puerto Rico implement direct programs of leadership development, educational services and advocacy.

At the national level, we foster the same services through our network with corporations, foundations, educational associations and governmental agencies. We work to ensure that the leadership and educational development needs of our youth receive appropriate attention from national educational organizations and the Federal Government.

It is with this in mind that I come to you today, to discuss what I believe to be the single most important educational issue affecting Puerto Rican youth: The dropout problem among Puerto Rican students in the United States.

USA Today recently provided a grim portrait of minority education based on a study released on January 28 of this year.

---

[3] Hollis, Meldon, "Education, Economics and Equity", The Review of Black Political Economy, published by the National Economic Association and the Southern Center for Public Policy of Clark College, 1983.

A panel of the National Coalition of Advocates for Students reviewed current research on U.S. schools throughout the Nation, interviewing educators, students and others in 10 different cities, and concluded that at-risk students, the poor, handicapped, and those with special education needs, suffer most from U.S. schools who are plagued with problems such as discrimination and over-reliance on standardized testing.

Furthermore, they found that one in four high school students drop out before graduation. In urban schools, the number climbs to 80 percent for Puerto Rican students.

One, the dropout rate for Hispanics are about twice that of the white students.

Two, tracking, the assignment of students to classes according to a fixed criteria results in a predominantly white upper-level courses.

Three, only 3 percent of teachers are adequately prepared to teach students of limited English proficiency in their classes.

Four, only 10 percent of Hispanic students with limited English proficiency receive special assistance.

Five, many school districts allocate substantially less money to schools in poor and minority neighborhoods.

While the statistics say much about the gravity of the situation, in order to grasp the full meaning of the devastating impact of these numbers that are likely to have on our community and what would be required on your part as policymakers and legislators if this trend is to be reversed, let us examine briefly some of the population trends that the U.S. Census has identified.

One, the average age of the white population is growing older; that of the minority population is much younger.

Two, minorities constitute the majority of school enrollments in 23 of the 25 largest school districts in the country.

Three, by the year 2000, 53 major cities will have a majority minority population.

Four, hispanic population growth has been and continues to be the highest and the youngest of all groups.

Let us return to the issue at hand: The plight of the Puerto Rican student. Puerto Ricans do not constitute a homogenious community of 3.5 million on the island and another 2 million here in the United States, as some statisticians would have us believe.

Mr. Chairman, I will skip some parts of the testimony also in consideration of the time factor.

The continental Puerto Rican population has increased rapidly since the end of World War II to more than 2 million people. The largest migration increases from Puerto Rico occurred during the 1950's. However, since 1960, the number of continental Puerto Ricans has doubled, but most of the increase has been due to the birth of children to Puerto Rican parents and not to migration from Puerto Rico, which has dramatically increased during this period.

This means that the population eligible for schooling has increased most rapidly in recent years and that the Puerto Rican population can no longer be characterized as a transient group of outsiders. As high as 98 percent of the Puerto Ricans live in urban

areas and more than half of all of these live in barrios—perhaps as high as 80 percent.

Alone, perhaps these statistics don't tell us much. However, when we couch these statistics in terms of what they mean for the future of our Nation, we realize the immediacy, the urgency of the situation. For instance, with respect to the age factor, the important point is that as majority citizens age, a larger percentage of this population will retire and become more dependent on the income and tax-producing capabilities of minority youth. Yet, these youths are not being prepared adequately for those sectors of the labor market in a technological society which will required skilled laborers.

The point must be emphasized and reemphasized: The growing minority populations represent an underdeveloped national resource that will become increasingly important to the Nation's economic, political, and military strength as the majority population ages. On the other hand, if they are not prepared for the labor force, the economy can not expect to prosper.

The basic question facing us today, then, is how to adapt policies to current and future realities in the face of such dramatic economic and demographic shifts. In order to ensure the retirement of the current generation of workers as well as the national economic health and military strength, the deciding factor becomes the quality of education received by young people today and tomorrow, and these young people come increasingly from minority populations.

Students have historically left school before completion. As late as 1946, less than half of all Americans had a high diploma, yet only recently has the dropout been seen as a problem. Why?

The answer lies in the changing structure of the economy since 1945. Once there was a time when a strong back and a willingness to work were the only requirements a person needed to fill a job. Today, the rapid advancement of technology, epitomized by the computer, is no match for the aging jibaro, or for his children.

This was confirmed by Dr. Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, who states that:

> If current dropout rates persist, more than 4.5 million minority students will, by the year 2000, leave school before they graduate. Poorly trained and unprepared for further education, they will face the prospect of social and economic failure.

At this point I would like to pass on to page 11, if you are following me.

There is one final point before I would like to make before I turn my attention to our specific policy recommendations. The dropout problem does not stand alone. Its repercussions permeate at all levels. Dr. William Jones, director of the Bureau of Dropout Prevention for the Chicago Board of Education, stated that over 90 percent of the juveniles incarcerated in Cook County are high school dropouts. It costs Illinois over $25,000 to maintain one juvenile for a 1-year period.

Dr. Isaura Santiago of Columbia University has noted several major policy shortsights contributing to the problem, including: (*a*) Budget cuts at the local level; (*b*) Absence of a language policy for Puerto Ricans; (*c*) Blaming the student; and (*d*) Tests and graduation promotional standards.

ASPIRA offers the following set of recommendations that I would like to introduce to you with a statement by Dr. Boyer:

> Unless we find better ways to serve minority students and help those who already have dropped out, the social and economic fabric of the Nation will be greatly weakened. And yet, the current debates about school reform is disturbingly silent on this point. Do we mean excellence for all, or do we mean for the privileged few?

One, of our policy recommendations is that policymakers at all levels must recognize and deal with the demographic implications and the needs of increasingly diverse populations. The needs of the Mexican-American population of the Southwest are different from the needs of Puerto Ricans in New York or Chicago, or Cubans in Miami.

The current immigration wave contains Caribbean, Central, and South Americans, as well as millions from Asia. Each of these population groups comes with a different cultural background, bringing with them different values, expectations, ways of living together and specifically, ways of learning.

Two, education policy needs to be more targeted and more tailored than has previously been the case.

It seems clear that much greater attention will have to be paid to the needs of minority young people and to the development of programs that are more responsive to their backgrounds and interests, for facilities and equipment to sustain these programs, and for teachers specifically trained to teach these particular populations.

Three, greater resources may have to be allocated to areas where the population concentrations of young people are greatest, while areas with fewer young people may have to be allotted fewer resources.

Four, more research is needed into how young people of different backgrounds learn, and existing research should be adapted for practical application to local conditions.

Five, the field of bilingual education and procedural requirements for obtaining and maintaining Federal and local funding have spawned a large array of studies and evaluations. Research is now needed to systematically analyze these program evaluations, synthesize a set of findings from them, and arrive at ways in which conclusive information can be obtained, and exert a return influence on the school systems where they are implemented.

Six, the few sound studies of these determinants of either the educational attainment or achievement among Puerto Ricans needs to be updated and supplemented.

Seven, a national Hispanic educational needs assessment of the 25 largest school districts in the Nation should be undertaken to provide comparative data as well as allow us to ascertain how and why some programs work and others fail for Hispanics.

Eight, a major effort should be spearheaded by the U.S. Department of Education to bring dropouts back into the educational process.

Nine, we believe in program consolidation of youth programs which would allow trainees to be placed with private employers for a tryout period of subsidized employment. However, we believe training should be toward jobs in the private sector as opposed to the public sector.

Educational decisions made today will affect the outcome to the benefit or the detriment of Hispanic youth. The record does not suggest that broad-brush aproaches to secondary school problems address the fine points of Hispanic needs. Confronted with the demands of a new kind of society, creative and innovative strategies must be developed.

I challenge you to ensure that President Reagan's statement in the State of the Union Address is implemented into effective policies, and I quote him:

This Government will meet its responsibility to help those in need. But policies that increase dependency, break up families and destroy self-respect are not progressive. They are reactionary. Despite our strides in civil rights, blacks, Hispanics and all minorities will not have full and equal power until they have full economic power.

Only our schools can make that happen.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Juan Rosario follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. JUAN ROSARIO, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ASPIRA OF AMERICA, INC., NEW YORK, NY

Good day, Honorable members of the Committee, Chairman Hawkins. My name Juan Rosario and it is an honor for me to stand before this Congressional Committee on Education and Labor and present testimony.

INTRODUCTION

I am testifying before you on behalf of Aspira of America, a national Hispanic organization in which I serve as Executive Director. Besides a doctoral degree in Education Administration and Education Policy from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, I was Assistant Superintendent of Schools in Newark, New Jersey until 1983, when I assumed my present position with Aspira of America.

Allow me to also introduce the organization I represent. Aspira of America has identified three primary goals as the focus of our mission, the development of leadership potential in Puerto Rican and other Hispanic youth:

First, to foster a commitment among Hispanic youth to dedicate their leadership skills toward the resolution of socioeconomic problems within our community;

Second, to motivate, orient and assist Hispanic youth toward their leadership, educational and intellectual development and;

Lastly, to increase access to quality educational opportunities for Hispanic youth through advocacy programs.

Aspira pursues these goals through a network of services and activities at the local and national levels. At the local level, offices in Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylania and Puerto Rico implement direct programs of leadership development, educational services and advocacy.

At the national level, Aspira of America fosters the further growth of leadership development, educational services and youth advocacy programs through our network with corporations, foundations, educational associations and governmental agencies. We work to ensure that the leadership and educational development needs of our youth receive appropriate attention from national educational organizations and the Federal Government. It is with this in mind that I come to you today, to discuss what I believe to be the single most important educational issue affecting Puerto Rican youth—the dropout problem among Puerto Ricans in the United States.

CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS

USA Today recently provided a grim portrait of minority education based on a study released January 28, 1985. A panel of the National Coalition of Advocates for Students reviewed current research on USA schools throughout the nation, interviewing educators, students and others in 10 different cities and concluded that "at risk" students—the poor, handicapped and those with special education needs—suffer most from US schools "who are plagued with problems such as discrimination and an overreliance on standardized testing".

Furthermore, they found that:

(a) 1 in 4 high school students drop out before graduation. In urban schools, that number climbs to 80% for Puerto Rican students.

(b) Dropout rates for Hispanics are about twice that for white students.

(c) Tracking, the assigning of students to classes according to a fixed criteria, results in predominantly white upper-level courses.

(d) Only 3% of teachers are adequately prepared to teach students of limited English proficiency in their classes.

(e) Only 10% of Hispanic students with limited English proficiency receive special assistance.

(f) Many school districts allocate substantially less money to schools in poor and minority neighborhoods.

While the statistics say much about the gravity of the situation, in order to grasp the full meaning of the devastating impact these numbers are likely to have on our community and what would be required on your part as legislators if this trend is to be reversed, let us examine briefly some population trends the U.S. Census Bureau has identified:

(a) The average age of the white population is growing older; that of the minority population is much younger.

(b) Minorities constitute the majority of school enrollments in 23 of 25 of the nation's largest cities.

(c) By the year 2000, 53 major cities will have a majority minority population.

(d) Hispanic population growth has been and continues to be the highest and youngest of all groups.

Let us turn to the issue at hand—the plight of the Puerto Rican student. Puerto Ricans do not constitute a homogenious community of 3.5 million on the island and another 2 million here, as some statisticians would have us believe.

Community growth patterns among Puerto Ricans have varied greatly—ranging from longstanding settlements as in Honolulu, Hawaii and Lorain, Ohio—to places where most Puerto Ricans have recently arrived from the Island. The continental Puerto Rican population has increased rapidly since the end of World War II to more than two million people, more than a thousand times the number first recorded in the United States Census of 1910. The largest migration increases from Puerto Rico occurred during the 1950s when the Island populace was encouraged to leave by prevailing conditions and the exodus was favored by commercial and political interests. Since 1960 the number of continental Puerto Ricans has doubled, but most of the increase has been due to the birth of children to Puerto Ricans parents and not to migration from Puerto Rico, which has drastically decreased. This means that the population eligible for schooling has increased most rapidly in recent years and that the Puerto Rican population can no longer be characterized as a transient group of "outsiders".

Continental Puerto Ricans have mainly situated themselves in large metropolitan areas. As high as 98% of the Puerto Ricans live in urban areas and more than half of all Puerto Ricans live in barrios—perhaps as high as 80%.

Alone, perhaps these statistics don't tell us much. However, when we couch these statistics in terms of what they mean for the future of our nation, we realize the immediacy, the urgency of the situation. For instance, with repect to the age factor, the important point is that as majority citizens age, a larger percentage of this population will retire and become more dependent on the income and tax-producing capabilities of minority youth. Yet, these youth are not being prepared adequately for those sectors of the labor market of a technological society that will require skilled laborers.

The point must be emphasized and reemphasized: The growing minority populations represent an underdeveloped national resource that will become increasingly important to the nation's economic, political, and military strength as the majority population ages. On the other hand, if they are not prepared for the labor force, the economy can not expect to prosper.

The basic question facing us today, then, is how to adapt policies to current and future realities in the face of such dramatic economic and demographic shifts. In order to ensure the retirement of the currrent generation of workers as well as the national economic health and military strength, the deciding factor becomes the quality of education received by young people today and tomorrow, and these young people come increasingly from minority populations.

THE DROPOUT

Students have historically left school before completion. As late as 1946, less than half of all Americans had a high school diploma, yet only recently has the "dropout" been seen as a problem. Why? The answer lies in the changing structure of the economy since 1945. Once there was a time when a strong back and a willingness to work were the only requirements a person needed to meet to fill a job. Today the rapid advancement of technology, epitomized by the computer, is no match for the aging jibaro, or for his children.

This was confirmed by Dr. Ernest L. Boyer, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, who states that: "If current dropout rates persist, more than 4.5 million minority students will, by the year 2000, leave school before they graduate. Poorly trained and unprepared for further education, they will face the prospect of social and economic failure."

A dearth of information exists in the field of educational research on the Puerto Ricans. Recent studies, reports and investigations fo little more than describe the general educational situation and problems confronted by Puerto Ricans in various cities. Except for sporadic studies, there have been few attempts to examine the overall protrait of education among Hispanics.

In 1976, Aspira of America published a study which was widely reviewed among the educational community for its challenging views on Puerto Rican dropouts. Authored by sociologist Jose Hernandez, the study concludes that the mechanism most conducive to dropping out may be the widespread practice of holding Puerto Rican children back a grade or more, when they are perceived by school authorities as having a language, learning or behavioral "problem." Students held back one or more years were of course older in terms of physiological and emotional development than other students at their grade level. Defined by the social environment as problems, they demonstrated strategies against boredom and depression that often led to truancy and other problems which facilitated the eventual solution: dropping out. Available evidence further indicates that some students are left back more than once, compounding the problem.

Faced with circumstances pressing them to work and support themselves and others, or with appealing alternatives to an unpleasant experience in schooling, dropping out represents a reasonable solution. Inflation and unemployment problems affecting the parents has compounded the problem as the children quit school to seek a job enabling the family to maintain a modest lifestyle.

Perhaps the most controversial of all studies to appear on dropouts was Isidro Lucas's 1971 *Puerto Rican Dropouts in Chicago*. This study was one of the first studies to attempt to explain the dropout rate and its causes among Puerto Ricans. Using Chicago Public Schools as a case study, the author attempted to discover the factors which contribute to or cause the dropout rate. Final figures for the study showed a cumulative dropout rate of 71% for all Puerto Rican students. Of these, 59% dropped out while in high school, usually during the first two years. Lucas found that the main personal reason for leaving school was that of identity. Other factors, such as the rejection of their parents' values and cultural characteristics were also noted.

ASPIRA OF AMERICA

Since the mid 1960s Aspira of America has been a forerunner in examining the education of Pureto Ricans. Since our first study, The Loosers was published, Aspira of America has served as a forum in which a wide variety of educational issues and concerns have been addressed from a Puerto Rican research perspective. These studies have been focused toward policy makers, school administrators, professional groups, educational researchers, as well as to Puerto Rican and other Hispanic parent groups involved in improving the education of their children.

Aspira's first major project, the Hernandez study mentioned, was funded by the Ford Foundation. The basic goals of the study were to identify the socio-demographic dimensions of the Puerto Rican student population throughout the country and to develop an initial understanding of their situations, characteristics and needs, with special reference to those cities where a major portion of the Puerto Rican people reside. Since then, we have undertaken dropout studies in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and Puerto Rico.

A report entitled Minority Secondary Education in New York State and New York City sparked a renewed debate which coincided with the release of numerous local and national reports on the crisis in our schools. This report estimated the current dropout rate for Puerto Rican youth as high as 80% and indicated that the

dropout rate of Puerto Rican and Hispanic students in New York City has actually increased over the last two decades.

In March, 1984, Father Charles Kyle summarized the results of Aspira of Illinois, Chicago Hispanic Dropout Study in testimony to the National Commission on Secondary Schooling for Hispanics. Father Kyle, in reporting for Aspira, cited that more than one half of all Hispanic youth entering Chicago public high schools did not graduate. He noted that the 1971 study that had charged that nearly three-quarters of the Puerto Rican youth dropping out of school has been ignored. The problem has been masked over the years by erroneous reporting.

A year ago, Aspira Inc. of Pennsylvania released a report, Dropping Out and Delinquency Among Puerto Rican Youths: A Longitudinal Study, which supported previous research.

During April of last year Aspira, Inc. de Puerto Rico sponsored a conference at which its Final Report of the Policy Analysis Project on Puerto Rican Dropouts Educational Advancement was released.

This report demonstrated that the Commonwealth also has an island wide attrition/retention problem. This was attributed by former Governor Roberto Sanchez to the failure of the Puerto Rican government to provide major economic support to private and community organizations, such as Aspira, devoted to educating and providing counseling to dropouts.

The general problem poses many unanswered questions, beginning with the fundamental need to know the dropout and delayed schooling rates for cities with sizeable Puerto Rican communities. Although seemingly easy to determine, the numbers are not generally available from school enrollment records, since these do not separately distinguish Puerto Rican students, except in New York City and Chicago. Data on school enrollment collected by the department of Education, and the Office of Civil Rights provide information for only the "Hispanic" category. In order to effectively evaluate the problem, data must be broken down. The generic term "Hispanic" is not sufficient.

Despite Aspira's many endeavors to document the plight of Hispanic education, the field of educational research as far as it concerns Puerto Ricans remains fairly barren. Much research, reflection and action are needed.

Recent research experience has demonstrated the necessity to go beyond the variety of studies, reports and investigations that describe the general educational situation and problems confronting Puerto Ricans in different cities, to a coordinated series of national studies and analyses.

Educators and concerned citizens must develop partnerships and coalitions with elected officials and leaders from the private sector to ensure that our youth have real educational and occupational opportunities open to them at all levels.

Support must be clear for the traditional values and cultural norms of our family structures which have always stressed the importance of schooling for gainful employment and social reconstruction. As a people, Puerto Ricans, along with other Hispanic communities, must continue to assume that schools can make a difference. It is up to elected officials to assure that this assumption is realized through full funding of educational programs and through innovative and comprehensive reform of school policies and practices.

There is one final point I would like to make before I turn my attention to specific policy recommendations. The dropout problem does not stand alone: Its repercussions permeate all levels. Dr. William Jones, Director of the Bureau of Dropout Prevention for the Chicago Board of Education, stated that over 90% of the juveniles incarcerated in Cook County are high school dropouts. It costs Illinois over $25,000 to maintain one juvenile for a one year period. There are 6 juvenile facilities in Illinois with a 1983 population of 1,098 youth, an increase of about 140% over 1980. This represents a cost to the taxpayers of Illinois of 27.6 million dollars in 1983 alone.

In New York State in 1976, 63% of juvenile crimes occurred on days when school was in session; high school dropouts were three to five times more likely to be arrested for committing juvenile crimes than those attending high school. Clearly, it is more cost effective for a society to reduce dropout rates.

Dr. Isaura Santiago of Columbia University, has noted several major policy shortsights contributing to the problem, including:

(a) Budget Cuts. Cuts in the Federal Budget have put pressure on local school systems to reduce the number of children in school, particularly minorities who are viewed as the most financially burdensome. Recent legislative proposals on civil rights, immigration, and education funding, have added fuel to the issue.

(b) Absence of a Language Policy for Puerto Ricans. Policy makers have not addressed the unique citizenship status of Puerto Ricans which points to the need for

maintenance of our youth's native language skills. Consistent findings on the relationship between the maintenance of Spanish and positive educational attainment have not been accepted as the basis for policy. Policy makers have preferred to strip the Puerto Rican student of his or her language while investing in offering other students the opportunity to learn Spanish and other languages.

(c) Blaming the Student. Our youth are often portrayed as lazy, having little aspiration, not being proficient in English, and of bringing a multiplicity of social problems with them into the schools.

(d) Tests and Graduation Promotional Standards. Tests which are purportedly designed to maintain educational standards largely serve to keep Hispanic students out of programs they need to remain in school and progress academically.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Aspira offers the following set of recommendations that I would like to introduce to you with a statement by Dr. Boyer: "Unless we find better ways to serve minority students and help those who already have dropped out, the social and economic fabric of the nation will be greatly weakened. And yet, the current debate about school reform is disturbingly silent on this point. Do we mean excellence for all, or for the priviledged few?"

(1) Policy makers at all levels must recognize and deal with the demographic implications and needs of increasingly diverse populations. The needs of the Mexican-American population of the Southwest are different from the needs of Puerto Ricans in New York City or Cubans in Miami. The current immigration wave contains Caribbean, Central, and South Americans, as well as millions from Asia. Each of these population groups comes from a different cultural background, bringing with them different values, expectations, ways of living together and specifically, ways of learning.

(2) Education policy needs to be more targeted and tailored than has previously been the case. Despite compensatory and bilingual programs, minority populations continue to remain at a disadvantage in the schools and the market place.

Based on the demographic data and the changing nature of the economy, it seems clear that much greater attention will have to be paid to the needs of minority young people and to the development of programs that are more responsive to their backgrounds and interests, for fscilities and equipment to sustain these programs, and for teachers specifically trained to teach particular populations.

(3) Greater resources may have to be allocated to areas where the population concentrations of young people are greatest, while areas with fewer young people may have to be alloted fewer resources.

(4) More research is needed into how young people of different backgrounds learn, and existing research should be adapted for practical application to local conditions.

(5) The field of bilingual education and procedural requirements for obtaining and maintaining federal and local funding have spawned a large array of studies, surveys, program descriptions and evaluations. Research is now needed to systematically analyze these program evaluations, synthesize a set of findings from them, arrive at ways in which conclusive information can be obtained, and exert a return influence on the school system where they are implemented.

(6) The few sound studies of these determinants of either educational attainment or achievement among Puerto Ricans need to be updated and supplemented.

(7) A national needs assessment of the 25 largest school districts in the nation should be undertaken to provide comparative data as well as allow us to ascertain how and why some programs work and other fail.

(8) A major effort should be spearheaded by the U.S. Department of Education to bring dropouts back into the educational process. Presently, federal funds are provided for dropout prevention programs that supplant rather than supplement local school district efforts. We believe that education is the mandate of local political jurisdictions and that they should have a mandate to educate.

(9) We believe in a program consolidation of youth programs which would allow trainees to be placed with private employers for a tryout period of subsidized employment. However, we believe training should be toward jobs in the production sector as opposed to service.

Educational decisions made today will affect the outcome to the benefit or the detriment of Hispanic youth. The record does not suggest that broad-brush approaches to secondary school problems address the fine points of Hispanic needs. Confronted with the demands of a new kind of society, creative and innovative strategies must be developed.

I challenge you to ensure that President Reagan's statement in the State of the Union Address is implemented into effective policies, and I quote him, "This government will meet its reponsibility to help those in need. But policies that increase dependency, break up families, and destroy self-respect are not progressive. They are reactionary. Despite our strides in civil rights, blacks, Hispanics, and all minorities will not have full and equal power until they have full economic power."

Only our school can make that happen. Thank you

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Rosario.

The attention that you give to the dropout problem causes some need to ask this question.

To what extent do you think this is due to the mobility of the population as opposed to the actual problem of the dropout in the school? In other words, do you believe that a lot of this could be explained by a people moving from one address to the other rather than, let's say, actually leaving school?

Dr. ROSARIO. Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that that is the case. In recent research, which was conducted here in New York City in 1977 through 1978, indicates that mobility among Hispanics is not the major issue that it had been thought to be. In fact, on the average, Hispanics have lived in New York City well over 5 years—on the average, and remain so, which compares favorably with the national trends in terms of mobility.

Chairman HAWKINS. Dr. Robinson, to comment on the same question.

Dr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, we feel that the climate in the schools and the degree to which staff are prepared to handle culturally different and culturally—well, just culturally different populations—has the greatest bearing on the rate at which young people choose to leave the formal school setting. That is, there are conditions which exist within the service delivery system.

Chairman HAWKINS. Dr. Minter has now joined the panel, and since the two have completed their statements, we will just ask them to complete answering the questions and then we will come back to you after we have given them an opportunity.

Dr. Rosario, on page 3 of your statement you mention that only 3 percent of teachers are adequately prepared to teach students of limited English proficiency in their classes. Do you mean that they are not bilingual, or just why this low percentage?

Dr. ROSARIO. In this statement we are quoting the National Coalition of Advocates for Students.

Yes, in many instances—there is another statement in there that says that only 10 percent of the students in need of special services are being served adequately. So that the answer is in the affirmative, Chairman Hawkins, that in many instances, teachers are not adequately prepared to provide instruction in the language of the student as required by the Supreme Court decision, that instruction be provided in the language that the student understands.

Chairman HAWKINS. In some States, notably my own, there is a requirement that if there are a number of students requiring bilingual education in any particular classroom, the teacher must be proficient in the language of those students.

I assume that is not true in very many States, then, is that true?

Dr. ROSARIO. That is not a policy across the country, no.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you. Mr. Jeffords?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I found the statements very enlightening and I appreciate the time that went into them. I don't have any questions.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Hayes?

Mr. HAYES. Just one question and I will direct it toward Dr. Robinson. I don't want to sound like a pessimist but I do like to be somewhat of a realist in some respects. I want to commend you for what has been a real, involved, and informative prepared statement—the both of you, for that matter, you and Dr. Rosario. But I was just thinking as you were going through it rather hastily, and trying to follow, and I will study it.

Some of us have a view, and I respect the Urban League as being one of the most highly respected civil rights organizations, you along with the NAACP, in our Nation. There are some of us who share the view that the de-emphasis on civil rights by this administration, which is exemplified by the attacks on the whole quota system which measure progress or change by the head of the Civil Rights Department and by the reduction in the available funds for educating the disadvantaged. And, yes, I was somewhat alarmed by the revealing figure of only 8.5 percent of our total teaching enrollment as minorities.

I wonder if you share the feeling that some of us have, that this whole thing is by design rather than accident, in educating our minorities. How can we change it? I know that's a broad question.

Do you actually share any feeling that during the next four years that things are going to get better rather than worse for minorities?

Dr. ROBINSON. Sir, you are asking me as a person or as an organizational——

Mr. HAYES. The Urban League particularly.

Dr. ROBINSON. The Urban League certainly. I think Mr. Jacob, in his State of Black America address—and I will provide the committee with some copies of that, if you don't already have this year's State of Black America, has gone on record as adjuring the current administration's position, and certainly saying to the black community that there are some things that we, of necessity, will have to look to ourselves in order to do.

Now I think I would be safe in saying that we do not see silver linings on any of the clouds that are on the horizon, and that this administration does not give any evidence of being supportive of some of the things that we stand for.

I would also like to add that 8.5 figure, in terms of minority representation in the teaching force, is a terrible jeopardy. If projections are true, concerning the attrition rate of black teachers from the teaching force in terms of—the regular attrition rate in terms of retirement, and then the impact of current competency testing.

I am not debating the issue, you know, of rights and wrongs, but those two things are going to reduce that figure to less than 5 percent in a couple of years. It is just of crisis proportions.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Owens?

Mr. OWENS. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Robinson and Dr. Juan Rosario, for very excellent statements.

The other panelist has arrived, Dr. Thomas K. Minter, dean of the Division of Professional Studies of Lehman College, representing the National NAACP. Dr. Minter, we are delighted to have you as a witness before the committee, and your statement in its entirety will be printed in the record at this point, and we look forward to your presentation.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS K. MINTER, DEAN, PROFESSIONAL STUDIES, LEHMAN COLLEGE-CUNY, REPRESENTING BENJAMIN L. HOOKS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

Mr. MINTER. Thank you, Chairman Hawkins. I apologize that I have only one copy that I have given to you but I will provide additional copies of the statement before the committee in very quick order.

Chairman Hawkins, members of the committee, and counsel:

I appear before you today to speak for Dr. Benjamin Hooks, the executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on President Reagan's proposed Education budget for fiscal year 1986.

As you know, I was the first person to hold the post of Assistant Secretary of Elementary and Secondary Education when the new Department was created during the Carter administration.

Prior to that post, I was the Deputy Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education in the the United States Office of Education.

So, appearing before you today, rekindles fond memories of appearances before this committee under the Chair of the late Congressman Perkins. And counsel Jack Jennings, who was then and continues to be, I am certain, a sharp questioner and knowledgeable questioner of witnesses.

Also, I have good memories, Mr. Hawkins, of several projects in which I was privileged to work with you, Mr. Smith and other members of your staff. And I say a special hello to Congressman Owens, who, when I lived in Brooklyn, was my Congressman, and also to Mr. Jeffords, before whom I have not appeared.

I am now the dean of the division of professional studies at Lehman College, the City University of New York, and I am responsible for oversight of departments of education, health services and nursing. In this position, and in my immediately prior position as deputy chancellor for instruction in the New York city public schools, I have retained my interest and active involvement in the education of children and young people in the public schools of this Nation, and most specifically, those students who are poor, who are representatives of minority groups, and who are in big city school systems.

In my new position I have been privileged to take on a similar concern in the area of higher education.

With your permission, I will make several general statements about the role of the Federal Government in areas of elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education, and then speak to one or two issues.

The President calls for excellence in education, and supports the finding of a secretarial commission which tells us that the Nation is at risk because of lowered educational effectiveness, yet, he proposes reducing the Federal effort and presence in education, tuition tax credits, vouchers and school prayer in elementary and secondary education.

For minorities, for the poor and the needy students in our Nation's public schools and colleges, the administration's recommendations spell disaster, continued inequities in access for the poor, and wipe out any assurance of completion of study at any level.

The role of the Federal Government in education since the passage of the NDEA under a Republican President and the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act under a Democratic president, plus a succession of amendments to the Higher Education Act has, in my opinion, been fourfold.

1. To provide Federal programs and funding which promote access and equal opportunity for the Nation's minority and economically poor populations: the mentally and physically handicapped, native speakers of other languages.

2. To expand the Federal effort to improve the quality of our Nation's schools and colleges.

3. To provide programs which address special Federal concerns such as school desegregation and others which are in the Federal interest.

4. To provide financial assistance to students to poor and to middle income college students, thereby guaranteeing access to higher education for the Nation's young people.

Members of the committee, I submit that these priorities are relevant and proper, and the Congress should continue to provide funding for these purposes.

Speaking first to the elementary and secondary education level, several issues are of significant importance. President Reagan's proposal for tuition tax credits will have the effect of encouraging and enabling middle class parents, black and white, to abandon the public schools and will leave public education to the poor of all races, to the handicapped, to the native speakers of other languages, and to the minorities.

The central purpose of the Federal Government and of the Federal role in education, not only in education, but in all are of governmental purpose, is to provide equity for all of its citizens. This purpose will be turned upside down. Under tuition tax credits, government supported programs will provide greater opportunity for the haves and less opportunity for those who have not.

Some say that federally funded education programs have not worked. On the contrary, there is evidence that students showed gains as a result of the education legislation of the 1960's and 1970's. Reports from the Perry pre-school project in Ypsilanti, MI indicate that the early childhood intervention, which was made possible by funding from Headstart and follow through, both noted Federal programs, resulted in:

One, a measurable readiness of poor minority students who completed elementary and high school education;

Two, increased numbers of poor minority children who entered some form of postsecondary education;

Three, a reduction in juvenile delinquency, and

Four, a higher degree of employability in the cohort of youngsters who have now reached 19 years of age.

The lasting effects after preschool study revealed similar information. The study reported three measurable significant findings. Children who had attended preschool programs:

One, achieved at a significantly higher level than did their counterparts who had not attended preschool classes;

Two, parents' aspirations for children who had attended preschool were higher and the parents' interest in their children's schooling remained at a high level for a much longer period of time than did the parents of children who had not attended preschool; and

Three, fewer children who had attended preschool were assigned to special education classes in the elementary school years.

These programs are basic and are the basic answer, I believe, to our dropout problems.

Last Sunday's New York Times, February 17, 1985, reported that there are a great number of economically deprived youths in the Nation's public schools—a greater number. "In the past 15 years there has been a dramatic increase in the number of children from poor and broken homes," the report indicates. The report, by Emily Friestritzer, "Cheating Our Children," says that one in five children now lives in poverty; that 23 percent of the children under the age of 6 are poor; that one in five children is being raised by a mother with no father in the home; that the number of households headed by women with no husband present has doubled since 1970 and tripled since 1960, and that one-third of all households headed by women are poor.

The importance of these statistics is made evident when we know that family income levels and the level of parents' education has a great effect, and perhaps the greatest defect, on the achievement of children in schools.

The recently published figures of the citywide reading tests in the New York City public schools, right here in this city, bear out the fact that schools and districts which enrolled children from high income families and with parents who have higher levels of education are those in which the achievement is the highest.

Absent the Federal role in the provision of equity programs and funding for the poor and minority children of our Nation, the successful completion of secondary school will be severely limited and the access to higher educational opportunity will be impossible for minority and poor children.

Turning to the area of higher education and to the administration's proposal for cutbacks in Federal student aid, I will confine my remarks and my analysis to students in New York State. Most of the statistical information that I will give was prepared by the Higher Education Services Corp., a unit of the New York State Government, Dr. Dolores Cross, president.

In Federal fiscal year 1984, New York State guaranteed 393,528 guaranteed student loans for a total of $936 million. This represented 12 percent of all dollars provided nationally through the guaranteed Student Loan Program.

Based on 1983-84 borrowing, the administration's proposal to limit guaranteed student loan eligibility to students and families with incomes of $32,500 or less would eliminate 95,880 loans—24 percent—and would reduce the total amount borrowed by $221.81 million. Undergraduate borrowing would be cut by 24 percent and graduate borrowing by 22 percent.

And most importantly, an additional 27,000 graduate students with incomes below $32,500 will have their guaranteed student loans reduced as a result of the proposal for a $4,000 cap on total Federal aid from all programs. Most graduate student borrowers now take loans of more than $4,000 per year. The estimated loss from this proposal will be $34 million. The combined proposals will eliminate or reduce guaranteed student loans for 75 percent of graduate student borrowers.

The proposal to limit Federal aid to $4,000 a year will have a more dramatic effect at State institutions such as Lehman College of the City University of New York, where the percentage of families have fewer resources available to meet the cost of a college education. So, it will not be just the private institutions that will be affected.

These families under the $4,000 cap will be limited to $4,000 in aid. Presently, a student's aid package may consist of the following Federal aid programs:

Pell Grant, $2,100 a year; National Direct Student Loan, $2,000; Supplemental Economic Opportunity Grant, $1,000; Nursing Student Loan, $1,000; College Work/Study Program, $1,500; Guaranteed Student Loan, $2,500, all of which come to somewhere around $6,000 or $7,000.

The cap will limit the aid package to $4,000, yet the cost, even at State institutions, as I have said, may exceed $6,000, requiring needier families to pay an unrealistic minimum of $2,000 a year.

The Federal cap will reduce also a present GSL borrowing maximum of $5,000 a year, reduced to $4,000 for fewer available aid dollars for graduate students.

Loan eligibility would also be significantly reduced by a proposal to require all students to undergo a family financial needs analysis. We estimate a $100 million reduction in loans as a result of this change.

A third proposal to cap Pell Grant income eligibility at $25,000 will eliminate approximately 12,600 New York Pell Grant recipients.

I believe you will agree that losses in aid of such magnitude would prove disastrous to postsecondary access for our State's students.

The effects of these changes, if enacted, will negatively impact the poor and minority students to a greater degree than the administration has indicated, approximately 80 percent of minority students across this Nation require some form of financial assistance.

The stringent reductions of student financial aid will cut off access to higher education for these students.

The recent Report on Minorities in Higher Education, prepared by the American Council on Education, states that since 1978, minority enrollments have made only modest gains against their pop-

ulation share; and, more importantly, that the enrollment of blacks in institutions of higher education has actually decreased.

According to the report, "Blacks experienced enrollment decreases in both 2-year and in 4-year institutions. Blacks represented 13 percent of the 18- to 24-year-old population. In 1980, only 9.2 percent of the college population are now enrolled in higher education institutions."

The report concludes with a sobering message:

"The prospect of a population that may be 35 percent minority by the year 2020, coupled with the alarming statistics for minority educational attainment, makes it clear that we are headed for a crisis, the consequences of which can be devastating to the country's prosperity and well-being. Enlightened self-interest, if not a concern for justice and equity, dictates that we must take whatever steps that may be necessary to reverse the trends that this report has highlighted."

I urge the members of this committee and of the Congress to override the President's recommendations as you have done in the past, and to continue providing the resources that will preserve the role that the Federal Government has played in education: that of providing for equity among all of our citizens, rich and poor alike, and for helping to alleviate the disproportionate social educational and financial burdens that poverty, race, and language difference place upon such a large segment of this Nation's citizens.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Thomas Minter follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS K. MINTER, REPRESENTING DR. BENJAMIN L. HOOKS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

Chairman Hawkins, members of the committee and counsel, I appear before you today to speak for Dr. Benjamin Hooks, executive director for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on President Reagan's proposed education budget for fiscal year 1986.

As you know, I was the first person to hold the post of Assistant Secretary of Elementary and Secondary Education when the new Department was created during the Carter administration. Prior to that Post, I was the Deputy Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education in the then U.S. Office of Education. So, appearing before you today, rekindles fond memories of appearances before this committee under the Chair of the late Congressman Perkins. Committee Counsel Jack Jennings was then, and continues to be, I am certain, a sharp and knowledgeable questioner of witnesses. Also, I have good memories, Mr. Hawkins, of several projects in which I was priviledged to work with you, Mr. Smith and other members of your office staff. I am pleased, also, to see Mr. Owens who was my Congressman when I lived in Brooklyn.

I am now the dean of the division of professional studies at Lehman College, the City University of New York, and am responsible for the oversight of departments of education, health services and nursing. In this position, and in my previous position as deputy chancellor for instruction in the New York City school system, I have retained my interest and active involvement in the education of children and young people in the public schools of this nation and, most specifically, those students who are poor, who are representatives of minority groups, and who are in big city school systems. In my present position I have been priviledged to take on a similar concern in the area of higher education.

With your permission, I will outline the Federal role in education as I perceive it, and then speak to several specific programs as they are listed in the President's budget.

The President calls for excellence in education, supports the finding of a secretarial commission which tells us that the Nation is at risk because of lowered educational effectiveness, yet proposes reducing the Federal effort and presence in educa-

tion, proposes tuition tax credits and vouchers and supports prayers in elementary and secondary education.

For minorities and for the poor and the needy students in our Nation's public schools and colleges, the administration's recommendations spell disaster, continued inequities in access for the poor, and wipe out any assurance of completion of study at any level.

The role of the Federal Government in education since the passage of the National Defense Education Act [NDEA] under a Republican President and the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA] under a Democratic President together with a succession of amendments to the Higher Education Act, has been fourfold:

(1) To provide programs and funding which promote access and equal opportunity for the Nation's minority and economically poor populations: minorities, mentally and physically handicapped, native speakers of other languages;

(2) To expand the Federal effort to improve the quality of our Nation's schools and colleges;

(3) To provide programs which address special Federal concerns, such as school desegregation and matters which are in the Federal interest; and

(4) To provide financial assistance to poor and middle income college students, thereby guaranteeing access to higher education for the Nation's young people.

I submit that these priorities are relevant and proper and the Congress should continue to provide funding for these purposes.

Speaking first about the elementary and secondary education, several issues are of importance. President Reagan's proposal for tuition tax credits will have the effect of encouraging and enabling middle class parents, black and white, to abandon the public schools and will leave public education to the poor of all races, the handicapped, and those who are native speakers of other languages. In the cities, these students in disproportionate numbers will be black and Hispanic.

The central purpose of the Federal Government and of the Federal role in education is to provide equity for all citizens. If the President's proposed tuition tax credit and educational voucher legislation is enacted, this purpose will be turned upside down. Under tax tuition credits and a system of education vouchers, Government-supported programs will provide greater educational opportunity for the "haves" and less opportunity for those who "have not."

Some say federally funded education programs have not worked. On the contrary, there is evidence that students showed gains as a result of the education legislation of the 60's and 70's. Reports from the Perry pre-school project in Ypsilanti, MI, indicate that early childhood intervention, which was made possible by funding from Head Start and followthrough, noted Federal programs, resulted in: [1]

(1) Increased numbers of poor minority students who completed elementary and secondary school education;

(2) Increased numbers of poor minority children who entered some form of post secondary education;

(3) A reduction in juvenile delinquency; and

(4) A higher degree of employability in the cohort of youngsters who have now reached nineteen years of age.

The "Lasting Effects After Preschool" study revealed similar information. The study reported three measurable findings.[2]

(1) Children who had attended preschool programs achieved at a significantly higher level in elementary school than did their counterparts who had not attended preschool classes;

(2) Parents' aspirations for children who had attended preschool programs were higher and the parents' interest in their children's schooling remained at a higher level for a much longer period of time than did the parents of children who had not attended preschool programs; and

(3) Fewer children who had attended preschool programs were assigned to special education classes in the elementary school.

These programs provide the basic answer to the dropout problems.

Although chapter I programs are recommended for level funding, I want to use this opportunity to reinforce the fact that federally funded programs which are spe-

---

[1] Schweinhart, L.J. and Weikart, D.P. "Changed Lives: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 19," High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, MI 48197 (1980).

[2] Lazar, Irving, et al., Lasting Effects After Preschool. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, DC, October 1978.

cifically targeted to needy students do work. In an article which I wrote for the Harvard Educational Review, November, 1982, "The Importance of the Federal Role in Improving Educational Practice: Lessons From a Big-City School System," [3] I cited the fact when the New York City school system sought to identify exemplary instructional programs in the city's schools that had raised student achievement, only those that had been funded from Federal sources (or through a combination of Federal and State sources) had undergone a "rigorous evaluation and validation process by both national and local standards." It was the congressional requirement that programs funded by chapter I be evaluated, that enabled New York City to prove that certain programs were exemplary. Each of the selected programs, in addition to having been rigorously evaluated, had been validated by the National Diffusion Network, funded by title IV-C of ESEA.

It should be noted also that it was the Congress that provided FY 1985 chapter I funding of $3.2 billion. This is an increase of $165,481 million over the President's FY 1985 request. I encourage the Congress to continue this level of funding support for chapter I.

It is significant to note, further, that chapter I has never been fully funded to meet the total universe of need. I would recommend a change in Education Department funding priorities that would provide enough additional funding to encourage States and local school districts to place an increased number of chapter I dollars at the intermediate and senior high school levels. Such a practice would provide greater assurance that chapter I eligible students would be afforded continuous instructional and counseling support throughout twelve years of elementary/secondary schooling. This practice would most certainly reduce the dropout rate of such students.

The New York Times of February 17, 1985,[4] reported that there are a greater number of economically deprived youths in the Nation's public schools than in the past. "In the past fifteen years there has been a dramatic increase in the number of children from poor and broken homes." The report by Emily Friestritzer, "Cheating Our Children: Why We Need School Reform," states that one in five children now lives in poverty, 23 percent of the children under the age of 6 are poor, one in five children is being raised by a mother with no father in the home, the number of households headed by women with no husband present has doubled since 1970 and tripled since 1960 and one-third of all households headed by women are poor. The importance of these statistics is made evident as we recognize that family income levels and the level of parents' education greatly affects the achievement of children in schools.

The recently published figures on the New York City public schools citywide reading tests demonstrate that schools and districts which enrolled children from high income families and whose parents have high levels of education are those in which academic achievement is highest.

Without the continued Federal role in the provision of equity programs and funding for the poor and minority children the successful completion of secondary school will be severely limited and access to higher educational opportunity will be impossible for minority and poor children.

I will mention briefly one other important program at the elementary and secondary level: Funding for school desegregation. Under the present administration, the Education Department's commitment to school desegregation appears to be negligible, if not hostile. Gary Orfield in his recent paper "Segregation Moves North" [5] cites statistics that are disheartening to those of us who believed that the "Brown decision", handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court thirty years ago, would mean an end to racially isolated public schools throughout the Nation. It is ironic that the Northeast section of the United States in 1980 had the highest level of segregated schooling of any region in the Nation. According to Orfield's report, 48.7 percent of black elementary and secondary school students in the Northeast attended 90–100 percent minority schools as against a nationwide average of 33.2 percent of black students attending 90–100 percent minority schools.

It is unfortunate that dismantling de facto racially segregated schools has proven to be more difficult than dismantling schools that have been segregated de jure. One proven cause of de facto segregation is the failure of political and school officials to

---

[3] Minter, Thomas K., "The Importance of the Federal Role in Improving Educational Practice: Lessons From a Big-City School System," Harvard Educational Review, (Vol. 52, No. 4, 1982), pp. 500–513.

[4] "More Deprived Youths Are Counted in Schools". New York Times, February 17, 1985, p. 59.

[5] Orfield, Gary. "Segregation Moves North: Desegregation of Black and Hispanic Students, 1968–1980", Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, DC, 1984.

provide early and rigorous leadership when dismantling single race schools in the early stages of de facto segregation.

School segregation and housing segregation are closely related. If the prediction of the Kerner report,[6] that this "Nation is moving toward two societies" is to be avoided, city-suburban desegregation plans and greater efforts to reduce segregated housing patterns in cities and suburbs must be mounted.

Turning to the area of higher education and to the administration's proposal for cutbacks in Federal student aid, I will confine my remarks and analysis to students in New York State.[7]

In Federal FY 1984, New York State guaranteed 393,528 Guaranteed student Loans (GSL) for a total of $936 million. This represented 12.5% of all dollars provided nationally through the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. Based on 1983–1984 borrowing, the administration's proposal to limit GSL eligibility to students/families with incomes of $32,500 or less would eliminate 95,880 loans (24%) and would reduce the total borrowed by $221.81 million (24%). Undergraduate borrowing would be cut by 24% and graduate borrowing by 22%.

Most importantly, an additional 27,000 graduate students with incomes below $32,500 will have their Guarantee Student Loans reduced as a result of the $4,000 cap proposed for total Federal aid from all programs. Most graduate student borrowers now receive loans of more than $4,000 per year. The estimated loss from this proposal will be $34.0 million. The combined proposals will eliminate or reduce Guaranteed Student Loans for 75% of graduate student borrowers.

Although State colleges, in general, have lower tuition rates than comparable private colleges, the proposal to limit Federal aid to $4,000 a year will have a more dramatic affect on students at State colleges. The cap will limit the aid to $4,000, yet the cost at State institutions may exceed $6,000, requiring needier families to pay $2,000 or more per year.

For example, at the City University of New York, where a large percentage of families have fewer resources available to meet the cost of a college education, one student's aid package may consist of the following Federal aid programs:

	Per yr
Pell Grant	$2,100
National Direct Student Loan	2,000
Supplemental Economic Opportunity Grant	1,000
Nursing Student Loan	1,000
College Work-Study Program	1,500
Guaranteed Student Loan	2,500

The Federal cap will reduce also a present GSL borrowing maximum of $5,000 a year to $4,000 aid dollars available for graduate students.

Loan eligibility would be significantly reduced by a proposal to require all students to undergo a family financial needs analysis. It is estimated that a $100 million reduction in loans as a result of this change. Another proposal to cap Pell Grant income eligibility at $25,000 will eliminate approximately 12,600 New York Pell Grant recipients. I believe, you will agree, that losses of such magnitude would prove disastrous to postsecondary access for our State's students.

The effects of these changes would negatively impact the poor and minority students to a greater degree than the administration has indicated as approximately 80% of minority students require some form of financial assistance. The stringent reductioins of student financial aid will cut off access to higher education for large numbers of minority students.

The recent Report on Minorities in Higher Education,[8] prepared by the American Council on Education, states that since 1978 minority enrollments have made only modest gains against their population share and, more importantly, the enrollment of blacks in institutions of higher education has actually decreased. The report further states that "Blacks experienced enrollment decreases in both two-year and four-year institutions. Blacks represented 13.0 percent of the 18 to 24 year old population in 1980, but only 9.2 percent of the college population (10.4 percent in two-

[6] The Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, chaired by Otto Kerner, stated in its summary: "This is our basic conclusion: Our Nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal." New York: Bantam Books, March 1968, p. 1.

[7] The statistical information in this section was prepared by the Higher Education Services Corp., a unit of the New York State Government, Dr. Dolores E. Cross, president.

[8] "Minorities in higher education." Office of minority concerns, American Council on Education, Washington, DC, 1984.

year institutions and 8.4 percent in four-year institutions)". The report concludes with a sobering message:

The prospect of a population that may be 35 percent minority by the year 2020, coupled with the alarming statistics for minority educational attainment, makes it clear that we are headed for a crisis the consequences of which can be devastating to the country's prosperity and will-being. Enlightened self-interest, if not a concern for justice and equity, dictates that we must take whatever steps may be necessary to reverse the trends we (the report) have highlighted.[9]

On behalf of the national association for the advancement of colored people and for the greater benefit of our nation, I urge the Congress to override the President's recommendations, as you have done in the past, and to continue providing the resources that will preserve the role that the Federal Government has played in education: providing equity and access to equal educational opportunity for poor and minority citizens, and helping to alleviate the disproportionately negative social, educational and financial burdens that poverty, race and language difference place on this large segment of the Nation's population.

The positions I have taken in this testimony reflect the official position of the NAACP. I close with a brief passage from a document written in July 1983, subtitled "an update of the 1977 NAACP report on quality education for black Americans: An imperative":[10]

The NAACP remains committed to the twin goals of excellence and equality in public education. Neither can be achieved on a national level without maintaining a strong public educational system; neither can be attained without the other. We call for all Americans to join together to support and improve our public education system; to act constructively to eliminate its deficiences, to resolve its problems; and to act in unison to ensure that equality education is available for every child.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Minter, for an excellent statement. Before I overlook it, I would like again to commend you on your very excellent record when you were in Washington. We miss you very badly, and I also want to thank you personally for all of your assistance that you have extended to me and the various programs that we happen to identify.

Dr. MINTER. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. As I read the various reports on excellence in education, Doctor, the impression that I get is that the administration is really giving up on minority students, that is, at least the 85 percent of the group that happen also to be poor.

The movement seems to be to concentrate the resources on the gifted as children from so-called well-to-do families on the basis that they can benefit most from it, and that the others, for various reasons, including their early leaving from school, their low achievement rates, and so forth, have been mostly written off—that excellence in this instance takes us all the way back to a certain amount of elitism in education, which, in a sense, is just bringing us back to the 17th, or at least the early 18th century.

Would you agree that in effect if the current trends continue that they would virtually eliminate or leave out educational opportunities for the vast majority of minorities?

Dr. MINTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I certainly would agree. I feel very strongly, and I think statistics bear us out in some of the testimony I have just given, that poor children who are in public schools mainly, are children that need extra supports. I am certainly all for rigorous study, rigorous curricula, high achievement.

---

[9] Ibid.

[10] "The NAACP Preliminary Report on Public School Education: An Update of the 1977 NAACP Report on Quality Education for Black Americans: An Imperative." National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Brooklyn, Heights, NY. 11201, July 1983.

But I recognize that students who are not given proper support, who are not given proper counseling, who do not know what opportunities exist, who come from homes where perhaps there is no breakfast, they eat breakfast in school many times; who come from homes in which there is a great deal of unemployment; in which very often children share their beds with vermin and rats, and so forth, that to expect these children to come to school prepared to learn with their full heads and hearts, I think is totally unrealistic and is to in effect write off the poor people in this Nation, most of whom are poor through no effect of their own.

I think the second point that you refer to—or one of the other points—the provision of classes for the gifted and talented. When I was in Washington, then Assistant Secretary of HEW, Mary Berry, used to always say, can't you find a way to fund title I children who are gifted and talented? She didn't believe that there were children who were title I eligible who were not gifted and talented. I don't believe it either. They are black and Hispanic and poor children of all races who are gifted and talented. But it is true that the majority of gifted and talented classes around this Nation are enrolled children of a majority race, and that gifted and talented classes in districts for poor children are scarce and very often not to be found.

So I think we have a role of providing the supports children need for excellence, or excellence in achievement. And I think also we have the obligation to provide a full range of programs for those not only who are disadvantaged, handicapped emotionally or physically, but also for children who are gifted and talented. I do not recognize or believe that spending money for children who are gifted and talented is an example of elitism.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you.

Mr. Jeffords?

Mr. JEFFORDS. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Owens?

Mr. OWENS. No, no questions, Mr. Chairman. I just want to congratulate Dr. Minter on an excellent statement and say just as he is missed in Washington, your intensity and conviction is very much missed in the New York City school system.

Dr. MINTER. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Minter. And thanks again to you, Dr. Robinson.

The next panel will consist of Dr. Ross Brewer, director of Planning and Policy Development, Department of Education, State of Vermont; Ms. Amina Abdur-Rahman, chairman, Education Priorities Panel, and coordinator, New York Urban League, and Ms. Yvonne Berry, chairman, City-Wide Coalition for Better Education in Public Schools, and chairman of the Education Committee, United Community Centers, Brooklyn, New York.

Let us hear from them in the order in which they were listed. Dr. Brewer, you are the first one.

STATEMENT OF ROSS BREWER, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, STATE OF VERMONT

Dr. BREWER. Thank you, Mr. Hawkins, and members of the panel. It is a pleasure to be here today. I did not bring my written statement with me. I will be sending it along.

I want to accomplish three things today: To offer some insight into problems of rural areas, using Vermont as an example; to give some examples of innovative practices which we have developed in Vermont in the last few years; and to emphasize the importance of the Federal role in the rural environment.

Obviously, the perspective which I bring is one which is at significant variance from what I have been hearing while I have been listening to the testimony this afternoon. While the perspective is different, I don't think the goals are different. The goals that we share with urban educators are essentially the same, that is to provide quality education for children. However, our problems are different problems—in part, difference in magnitude, in part, difference in character.

Let me start with the Vermont context. Vermont, like many other rural States, is, first of all, rural; second, small, and; third, has limited resources. In terms of rural, the terrain is characterized by mountains, valleys, and streams, and gives rise to what I thought was a Vermont comment until I tried to find the school today, wandering up and down Pearl Street, which is that you can't get there from here. And often that's the case in Vermont, it is very difficult to get from one place to another. For example, my daughter attends a school which is 2 miles from our home as the crow flies, but it is a 12-mile drive to get her there. So that's the first point: rural characterized by difficult communication and transportation problems—small.

Mr. Minter, in his testimony a moment ago, noted that there were 323,000 guaranteed student loans given in New York State last year. Well, that's not quite the total population of Vermont but it begins to approach it. And as I travel around the country to various meetings, I am always struck by how there are often as many teachers in a State, or perhaps almost in a city, as there are in our entire system. We have about 95,000 public school students and a teaching force of about 6,000.

The typical school in Vermont is small. An elementary school, for example, will be about 150 to 200 students. We have 16 area vocational centers. They range in size from 100 to 600 students. So we are talking smallness here, small scale. That has real implications in terms of a school's or a district's ability to develop programs to engage in planning or to evaluate the programs that they have. Very few schools or school districts in Vermont have curriculum coordinators, for example. Very few schools have trained evaluators who can really evaluate the quality of the teaching that goes on in the classroom.

Even our supervisors, our district superintendents—and there are 59 of them in the State—do not have planning or curriculum capacity. Typically, a superintendent will work for six to eight local school boards, all representing the small schools which I am talk-

ing about. They spend a tremendous amount of their time just doing the administrative trivia in attending school board meetings. If there are six boards that you are serving and they meet twice a month, that means that a superintendent is typically out 10 or 12 nights in a 2-week period attending school board meetings. That is a tremendous drain on their energy. It also means again that they don't have this kind of opportunity.

Smallness also limits the degrees of freedom available to educators in the State—and I mean local educators as well as the State level—to develop programs or to deliver programs. Let me give you another anecdotal example. We have just recently hired a new director of special education for the State. We hired him away from a Chicago suburban school district, or a series of districts—he ran a regional program.

His population for that special education program was 10,000 students, 10,000 special education students in an area of 24 square miles. In Vermont, we have just a little bit less than 8,000 education students in an area of 9,600 square miles. Now, you know that when you are looking at problems of special education handicaps of that order, often you will find one, two, three in a fairly wide area. So it means for developing effective programs for those kids becomes very difficult because you not only get in the problems of programs themselves but you get into problems of transportation, administration, and so on, as well.

Some of our special education teachers often end up being more like circuit riders than teachers, going from school to school to school. The same thing is true for our vocational education programs and the same thing is true for what few gifted and talented programs that we have been able to mount in the State.

The small numbers limits the options and opportunities for developing programs. It is a real problem for rural areas. And as a result of that, the State role becomes much more important in aiding schools with these limited resources. We end up acting very much as a program developer, a program coordinator, an instigator, and as consultants to local districts.

Let me turn to my second point. I want to give you briefly examples of a few initiatives which we have mounted at the State level, often in cooperation with local districts, always in cooperation—we always cooperate with local districts in the State.

But I think that these initiatives represent interesting and new departures, at least for us. The first is the development of new school approval standards which were adopted by the State Board of Education last fall. These represent a significant departure from what existed before. What existed before were essentially numerical ratios, number of books in a library per student, number of square feet in a classroom, and so on.

The new standards are much more qualitative in nature. The principle which drives the standards is that students, regardless of where they live and who they are, should have access to a quality education. That is the principle that drove the development of the standards.

Quality is defined in terms of the academic programs contained in the standards, the school characteristics, expectations of student performance, and so on. It is a driving principle that these are the

elements that are important in improving the quality of education in Vermont.

As we developed the standards over the last year or two, we recognized early that there was an important interplay between the curriculum areas—mathematics, science, social studies, the arts, and so on. There was an important interplay between curriculum areas and standards for other areas. For example, we have a section in there on school climate in the standards, and we have a statement in that section that says the school is a bright and inviting place.

There was tremendous pressure on the State Board of Education to take that statement out and it is an incredibly difficult thing to measure. But the State Board, I think to their credit, stood fast and said a school should be a bright and inviting place. And we are going to have to figure out how we are going to measure and how it is going to be implemented.

There are sections in the standards on educational leadership that, for example, outline the job of a principal. There are sections in there for professional development for teachers that say essentially every school should have a professional development program that will be developed by teachers in cooperation with the administration. There are sections that require the assessment of student performance and the coordination of curriculum between schools.

Another point that came out as we developed the standards was that there must be parity between what is to be evaluated, how it is to be evaluated, and by whom. Each of those is important. The standards cannot stand by themselves—process is as important as substance if you are going to improve education.

As I said, the old standards were a compilation of ratios and numerical indicators. The new standards rely on the judgment of peers and the wisdom of informed citizens. The focus is on the education taking place in the school, not on the shell or the skeleton from which its programs are hung.

The process is that the school, and that means faculty and administration go through a rigorous process of self-assessment that takes about a year. They conduct that self-assessment, by the way, with standards that the State has developed.

Following that self-assessment, a team of educators from other parts of the State, as well as citizens, school board members from other parts of the State—or people who have been nominated or nominated themselves—go to a school, spend several days in that school, read the self-assessment, visit classes, talk to teachers, parents, students, administrators, and essentially make a judgment about that school.

The report from the visiting team is then sent to the Department of Education, and the school is bound to develop a plan of improvement which will show both time lines and what they are going to do to address those recommendations made by the visiting team.

We think it is an exciting, bold concept, and it is something that first team visits will be starting in just about a month—and it's a 10-year program, by the way. It is something that has gone very well and we are very excited.

Let me just briefly mention a couple of other initiatives. We are developing an inservice institute that essentially is designed to train teachers and administrators to develop effective professional development programs at the school level. You can't deliver professional education in the same way that you educate children—educating adults is different, and professionals particularly. We recognize that and I think that we recognize that you will not have effective professional development unless teachers at the school level are involved. That is what the inservice institute is designed to do: First to train a cadre of teachers in every school district to do the design and development of inservice activities.

And, second, to perform a brokerage function, by maintaining a registry of people in the State and outside the State in a variety of fields who can provide inservice professional development activities for teachers around the State.

We are also developing a leadership academy for principals and superintendents.

The third initiative are what we would call governors' institutes for motivated and talented students—the motivated and talented students is in parentheses, they are just called governors' institutes.

I would say that these have probably provided me with more immediate satisfaction than anything else I have been involved in in the last 3 years with the department.

We have had them in the arts, world affairs, and next year we are adding science and technology. At the arts institute, the environment, the climate, is just electric. You take kids from small schools, talented students in dance, drama, painting, music, what have you—often when they are in a small school, middle school, or high school, they feel very isolated. They are isolated because they stand out, they are different.

What we have been able to do is to take those kids and bring them together to a college campus for a period in the summer, and just turn them loose would be the wrong word, because they are effectively supervised and the teaching staff has been just outstanding. But they go crazy—and I mean crazy in a positive and a creative sense. The work that they have turned out has been just phenomenal.

Two more briefly. The early education institute takes teachers, administrators, and school board members and brings them to a college campus for a 2-week period during the summer where they listen to consultants, to outside speakers, to workshop leaders, and so on, and develop and plan early education programs for their districts. We don't provide money for the plans, for implementing the plans, but what we do do is to give them the opportunity to come into contact with other people who are interested and other people who are expert in the field. And that has worked very well.

Finally, our Resource Agent Program, or RAP, as we call it, identifies the most successful teachers in the State, and allows them, by paying for their release time and paying for their mileage, allows them to share their ideas and techniques with other teachers around the State through workshops, individual consultation, and onsite visits.

What this does is, first, to recognize outstanding teachers—they don't get much money for it, $50 a day, I think is what they get for going to another school—but they do get some sense of recognition. And it does provide and promote inservice in other schools where it is most needed.

Now, finally my last point: The Federal role as it relates to all of this—what Federal dollars have done for a State like Vermont, which has the characteristics that I described, is to provide the margin that allows us to undertake these kinds of initiatives, both at the State and the local level.

Each of the initiatives that I have described has in some way been aided by Federal funds. The governors' institutes, for example, were funded—the original seed money came from chapter 2 funds. We also use business dollars, dollars that we got from foundations, local districts contributed when they sent children, and if they could afford to, the children contributed themselves, although that was not a requirement.

Now that that program has been successful, we have gone to the legislature this year and incorporated money for the institutes in our own budget. But the Federal money—the chapter 2 dollars there—were critical in terms of allowing us to develop that kind of initiative.

The same thing is true of the inservice institute, the early education initiative, and to a lesser extent, even the school approval standards.

The point is that States with limited resources rely particularly on the small margin that Federal funds offer. There is rarely an inch in a State like Vermont to make change or to innovate, to intervene in a positive way to change the system. We just haven't got the resources to do it.

What happens is that the Federal funds give us that small degree of opportunity to do that. And the same thing is true for most of our local schools. They take their chapter 2 funds and use it for computers, for inservice, for gifted and talented programs.

We have also used our chapter 2 funds, by the way, in another way. If you imagine a rural isolated school looking for some kind of help in terms of consultant to develop a science program or to develop an inservice capacity, or whatever, they don't have the opportunity to do it and they have a very hard time finding someone who can do it for them.

So that what we have done is to take a bit of our chapter 2 money to pay for department consultants to go and work with those districts as they have tried to develop innovative programs or to revise or change their curriculum.

So the Federal role, then, in a State like Vermont, with rural character, limited resources, small schools, has been critical, particularly in general education. It is also true in special education and vocational education, and those are areas that I haven't addressed in this phase of my testimony.

I think I have chosen to highlight the chapter 2 relationship because there really hasn't been a continuing base for developing general education programs. Special education and vocational education funds have certainly not kept up with the need that is there in Vermont as it is in other States. And I think that each of those

needs to be addressed—special education, vocational, and general education issues.

Thank you very much.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you.

Let me try again. Amina Abdur-Rahman, chairperson, Educational Priorities Panel, coordinator, New York Urban League.

STATEMENT OF AMINA ABDUR-RAHMAN, COORDINATOR EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES PANEL, NEW YORK CITY

Ms. ABDUR-RAHMAN. Thank you very much, Chairman Hawkins, and members of the committee.

I am Amina Abdur-Rahman, coordinator of the Educational Priorities Panel, but only director of education programs for the New York Urban League.

The Educational Priorities Panel is a 9-year old coalition of 24 major parent and civic organizations that monitors the spending and management practices of the New York City Board of Education in order to ensure that public school children receive the maximum benefit possible from the almost $4 billion spent on public education in New York City.

In practice that means that we seek to make sure that dollars are spent effectively and efficiently, that adminisrative costs are kept to a minimum, and that the highest quality instruction and support services for children are the top priority in school budget decisionmaking.

Since financial issues are our focus, I am here today to speak mainly about the Federal Government's fiscal responsibilities in the area of public education.

The EPP was forged out of the fiscal turmoil that descended upon this city in 1975, when municipal services were being drastically slashed to balance the budget, and public school children were being asked to bear more than their fair share of the burden.

Who are the public school children of New York City? By any definition, they are a diverse and disadvantaged population. As an indication, 95 percent of the lunches served in New York City public schools are free or at reduced price. Twenty percent of New York City's children live in poverty by Federal standards, compared with 13 percent nationwide. Fifty-five percent live in female-headed households; English is a foreign language for about one-third of the 945,000 students; 73 percent are members of racial minority groups; and almost 12 percent have handicapping conditions. Almost half are reading below grade average and also almost half—probably the same half—will never complete high school. For minority students, the proportion of dropouts soars to over 60 percent, by most estimates.

Primary responsibility for educating these children, by virtue of our constitutional system, lies with the State of New York. Nevertheless, New York State pays for less than 40 percent of the cost. The Federal role in education has been large in policy and direction, but minuscule in financing. But there is a Federal role in education and we see it clearly, most clearly, when the national interest is challenged.

For reasons of economics and international competition, for example, funds have been provided for vocational education. After sputnik, math and science programs were given increased support. In the 1960's, we saw a shift to an emphasis on equality of opportunity, as the Federal Government recognized that it was the protector of last resort for the disadvantaged and the powerless who were being denied equal access to locally-provided services.

In both of these roles, there is a clear right to Federal involvement, and a need for Federal funding, because the national interest is at stake.

The members of the Educational Priorities Panel maintain that the Federal Government must not retreat from its responsibility to ensure that students with special needs receive necessary services.

In the last year, we have seen once again the awakening of a nationwide concern about education, and a recognition that once again our economic and technological standing in the world market is threatened. We are now at a crucial crossroads. The decisions you make, or the decisions made at the Federal level, will determine the future for public school students, particularly in the Nation's largest cities.

As has been noted recently by the National Coalition of Advocates for Students, this national movement could have the potential for restricting the rights and opportunities of disadvantaged students if their needs are overlooked. On the other hand, it could expand their opportunities if every effort is made to bring them along on the quest for excellence.

Unfortunately, at the present time, it is the former outcome that seems more likely because, unlike prior movements, the national shift in educational policy is being accompanied by a rather perverse shift in fiscal policy. While national commissions are calling for major new financial commitments to upgrading our schools, the administration in Washington has been seeking to reduce its support of public education.

Without the necessary additional resources, there is no doubt that the students who need the most help to meet tougher course requirements will be the ones to be neglected and left behind. We need action from this administration, not cheerleading.

Perhaps it is this contradiction between the clear national priority for better schooling and this trend in national financial policy that recently led John Brademas, President of New York University, to characterize the administration's efforts to cut Federal education funding as a "mindless shifting of Federal responsibility."

According to figures released by the National Education Association, Federal aid as a proportion of total school spending has fallen to its lowest level since the 1960's, to 6.4 percent from a 1980 high of 9.2 percent. Certainly, if our desire for better schools is sincere, such a shift is indeed mindless.

Furthermore, cuts in education aid do not tell the whole story. Reductions in child health and nutrition programs, in employment training, mental health and income support will all affect the ability of children to learn in school.

Furthermore, they will disproportionately affect the children in New York City, where 30 percent receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children, compared to 12 percent nationwide, and there is

room in publicly-funded day care facilities for only 40 percent of those who are eligible.

Between the 1980–81 school year and last year, Federal funds dropped from 15.5 percent to only 11.5 percent of the city's education expenditures. During that same 4-year period, Federal funds increased by less than 5 percent, while the city raised its support for public education by almost 50 percent. Thanks to the work of this committee specific programs have been maintained.

And Federal funding, always far short of meeting the cost of Federal mandates, did not suffer the actual reductions proposed by the President.

Specifically, chapter I aid for disadvantaged students has recently increased following funding cuts in 1982. However, thousands of eligible students remain unserved.

With the help of this subcommittee, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act is a significant step by the Federal Government to earmark funds to serve special populations. We applaud the set-asides for disadvantaged, limited English proficient and handicapped students, all of whom are underserved in city vocational and occupational programs.

Money designated for sex equity purposes is very much needed in New York City where training opportunities for female students remain extremely limited. Most of these students are enrolled in schools which only offer training for stereotypically female jobs which offer low pay and little hope of advancement. Only 7.6 percent of female students are enrolled in traditionally male training programs. The rest of the young women are segregated into 5 of the city's 20 vocational high schools.

To ensure implementation of the mandated set-asides, there must be an appropriation to fund both basic services and the provisions designed to increase access to underserved populations.

The elimination of impact aid, which most people think of as benefiting districts with military bases, caused the loss of $23 million because of New York City's many Federal housing projects.

Bilingual aid, too, has fallen, despite the fact that New York City is still the Nation's primary recipient of immigrants. Our public schools serve more than 50 different language groups, and we provide bilingual or ESL instruction for only 13 of them.

The one aid category that has grown is aid for children with handicapping conditions—from $13 million to $20.5 million. However, the actual aid per student has dropped since New York City is now providing special education to more than twice as many students.

This is a cruel hoax, compared to the level of aid originally authorized under the Education of All Handicaped Children Act of 1975. This law, while mandating a much needed range of services for these children, anticipated and authorized a Federal funding role of 40 percent of costs.

Ten years later, appropriations have never covered more than 8 percent of costs in New York City, while we are serving about three times as many of the underserved students as we did in 1975. In fact, many experts are attributing the growing number of referrals to special education to the fact that the regular education system is starved for the kinds of support services, small classes,

and alternative programs that the special education system is mandated to provide.

It is time for the Federal Government to provide sufficient funds to serve all eligible students in Federal programs.

Finally, Chapter 2, which represents dozens of categorical programs now consolidated into a single block grant, has also shrunk by about 15 percent, although the anticipated administrative savings from consolidation never really materialized.

The effect of this cut on disadvantaged children was exacerbated by changes in regulations that allowed the funds to be distributed citywide, including private schools and more affluent districts, rather than being targeted to the neediest areas.

According to the National Committee for Citizens in Education, only 17 States are now directing chapter 2 funds to high-need districts.

That is the status of Federal education funding. Although the President's proposals for Federal fiscal year 1986 do not include cuts for elementary and secondary education, this is not the full story.

As I noted, New York City has used its local tax revenues to support education in light of Federal cuts. However, as explained by the mayor in his testimony before the Budget Committee, New York City is slated to lose substantial revenues for housing, transportation, and economic development in the President's proposal.

We cannot plug all of these holes. It will be impossible for the city to continue to increase education funds at a time when other city services are suffering.

I would like to mention two other issues before closing. The members of the EPP are unanimous in our belief that public funds ought to be devoted to public education and we will oppose any legislative efforts to undermine that principle. Particularly at a time when Federal support for public education is declining, there is no rationale for introducing tuition tax credit proposals, for example, to support private education.

Finally, title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is the only Federal law against sex discrimination in education. Since its passage 13 years ago, title IX has been the catalyst for dramatic gains in educational opportunities for women and girls. However, efforts to remove sex discrimiation from schools must continue with the help of active Federal enforcement.

As a result of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Grove City* v. *Bell*, Title IX enforcement activity has been significantly narrowed or halted completely. We urge you to support legislation to restore the original congressional intent to prohibit sex discrimination in our Nation's schools.

In closing, let me say that we in New York are ready to take up the challenge to improve public education. We have increased the budget, we have undertaken new initiatives and we are responding to the new standards enacted by our own State Board of Regents.

The Educational Priorities Panel represents consumers of public education who are also, as taxpayers, the funders of our schools.

We will continue to monitor the New York City Board of Education and make sure that promises and budget increases are translated into the highest quality education for our students, but you

must join us in this effort. The Federal Government cannot abdicate its role in preparing young people for the future.

Thank you.

Mr. OWENS [presiding]. Thank you, Ms. Abdur-Rahman.

Ms. Yvonne Berry.

STATEMENT OF YVONNE BERRY, CHAIRPERSON, THE COALITION FOR BETTER EDUCATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, THE UNITED COMMUNITY CENTERS, BROOKLYN, NY

Ms. BERRY. My name is Yvonne Berry. I am the chairperson of the Coalition for Better Education in Public Schools which works closely with our Congressman from the 12th Congressional District in Brooklyn, Major Owens.

I am also chairperson of the Education Committee of the United Community Centers, an interracial, nonsectarian, membership organization located in the east New York section of Brooklyn where I live. I am speaking for these groups today.

I am not here to offer you facts and figures on the benefits of Federal elementary and secondary education programs, nor on the disasters which cutting Federal funds has wrought. Other organizations and agencies, including the New York Board of Education, the State department of education, even your own research staff, can compile and analyze the data far more readily.

Instead, I want to talk about some of the basic ideas which ought to inform and guide any statistical analysis: Who should be educated?

What shall they learn?

What is the role of government?

Whom do we include in the struggle to achieve our goals?

I start with the belief that I am testifying before the most important committee of government—far more important than any congressional committee of the Armed Forces.

In one of your aspects—labor—you are charged with a concern for the livelihood of the vast majority of our citizens. As an active union member, I know how important that is.

And, in your concern for education, you are charged with mapping the direction and to a significant extent, creating the future of our society. Your leadership, your willingness to challenge the President's direction can lay a basis, and signal a direction which supports and makes more possible the ability of people in communities to struggle for a future which is dramatically different from our current situation.

I live in a community, the east New York section of Brooklyn, which is a working class and working class poor, mainly black and Hispanic area, with small sections of black and white lower middle class families. We also have an influx of Asian families.

Around 23,000 children are enrolled in our community district's elementary, intermediate, and junior high schools. Ranked by reading scores, our district is in the bottom third of the city's schools. In only 3 of the district's 27 schools, are one-half of the children reading at or above grade level. The vast majority are far below. And the situation is getting worse. Recent Federal budget cuts

have already marked their impact: between 1983 and 1984, scores in reading and math went down.

In the three high schools in our area, between two-thirds and three-quarters of the students score 2 or more years below grade level in reading and mathematics examination. In New York City as a whole, the high school dropout is close to 50 percent. In our community, between 60 and 75 percent of entering high school students do not graduate.

Two years ago, in the so-called academic high school, only 22 students passed the statewide standard geometry examination—in a school of over 2,000 with a sophomore class of over 700. Our students don't even begin to learn the formal process of reason, or the power of the human mind.

This year, in one of the vocational schools, juniors and seniors are enrolled in the same machine shop class with only enough equipment for half of them. Of course, the seniors use the machines three-quarters of the time because they are due to graduate. The juniors learn that the school doesn't care much about what they learn.

In addition, we are a community in which the organized school-related extracurricular activities and other after school programs which might enable young people to discover their talents, interests, and even themselves, have been removed over the last 10 years.

The fact is that young people in our community face the same questions they always and everywhere face: Who am I?

What shall I become?

What kind of friend do I want?

And what kind of a friend do I want to be?

How do I want to be related to my community, to adults, and to my world?

The problems they must face they must contend with are low incomes, poverty, unemployment, racial discrimination—are greater.

But what is worse, far worse, is that they do not get what all young people need: responsibly supervised opportunities and direction to develop themselves and explore how they want to grow up.

It has become far more difficult for young people either to develop their own intellectual tools or to get help to find rational, democratic, and responsible solutions to their problems.

It is not surprising that the most dramatic events of the week in a local junior high school across the street from the United Community Center's office are the fights which break out before school in the morning, during lunch, and after school breaks at 3 o'clock. The kids move in waves of 500 up and down the block for the latest spark of excitement. Generally, the fights are fairly easy to break up, but sometimes they aren't. The police are called and, unfortunately, sometimes use excessive force which further turns off the kids, most of whom are not involved in the fight, anyway, except as provocative audience.

And it is no wonder that our community has one of the highest crime rates in the city, one of the highest rates of juvenile delinquency, youth unemployment, and drug abuse. Our kids are being flushed away.

In President Reagan's and Secretary Bennett's vision of American society, these kids are expendable. Better to let them drift off to drugs and the dazed existence of uneducated provincialism. Then, even well meaning people will blame the situation on the young people's lack of skills, their illiteracy, their home life, et cetera—and not on a society which tolerates unemployment and poverty for millions of its citizens, inadequate food, shelter, and health care for its children and elderly.

The solution, under President Reagan, is to cut Federal funds and strangle education in lower middle class, working class, and working class poor communities.

Our vision of American society demands the full participation of these young people as thinking, rational, critical human beings who have mastered the intellectual tools and knowledge they need to help to find solutions to the problems which our society faces and which our leaders up to now cannot solve.

These are problems of survival—of nuclear war and peace, of hunger and poverty, of environmental exploitation and destruction, of racial and ethnic discrimination.

I represent people who start with the assumption that all young people can participate fully in our culture, intellectual traditions, and that what we need is a more democratic system of public education.

What do we mean by a more democratic system of public education?

We are talking about equalizing access to education for the poor, for linguistic and other minorities.

We are talking about equalizing the resources of education available to those in communities which are not the wealthy suburbs of our Nation, which cannot raise through property taxes the kind of money needed for excellent education.

These are rural and urban communities, whose children would be deprived of needed educational resources without Federal aid.

We are talking about making the schools a testing ground for the world we want—where young people of different cultures, races, ethnicity, and economic status learn to deal with the difficulties of living and learning together.

We are talking about the racial integration of schools, a timid step toward greater democracy which has been largely undone by the current administration.

Whatever limited progress this Nation has made in the direction of more democratic public schools has been due to the involvement of the Federal Government, financially and through its enforcement agencies.

It seems to us that our primary goal must be to re-establish the concept of Federal responsibility for education, to enlarge rather than reduce the financial involvement of the Federal Government. This is an unpopular thing to say, but it is not an issue we can evade or finesse.

Historically—and it is not a very long history—whatever progress has been made in the direction of a more democratic system of public education has been due to the struggles of people and the assumption of responsibility by the Federal Government.

As Federal funds recede, we are seeing in sharp outline the class structure of education in our city, State, and Nation. It is hardly news that education in the United States reflects the class divisions of our society, complicated further by racial and ethnic divisions.

For example, in our own city everybody knows who attends the regular general high schools, who attends the special academic high schools, and who attends the vocational schools.

These regular high schools are reserved for the working class and poor, in New York City, primarily black and Hispanic, who have such profound difficulties in school that they cannot even gain admittance to the vocational schools—historically the site for the secondary education of working class youngsters. It will take massive infusions of money to change the educational experience of these young people.

Unfortunately, even friends of education have come to accept the limitations placed on Federal funds and Federal responsibility. They look for ways to provide a way out, some avenue of upward mobility for the talented minority, the ones who can be saved, within the working class poor population. Alternative schools, redesigned schools, academies—all offer some hope to a few. They are no solutions at all as long as the majority are dumped unceremoniously into schools which don't even have enough money for athletic programs, never mind dealing with the multiple academic problems of young people.

Unfortunately, even the most dedicated educators and friends of education can be heard saying that in today's political climate we have to look for solutions that don't cost money.

Frankly, we don't believe there is any free lunch. If we don't spend the money on education, we will spend it on police, courts, penal institutions, and welfare.

Funding is the measure of our society's commitment to achieving goals. When Congress tries to cut the military budget, the President doesn't hesitate to accuse it of lack of commitment to national defense.

On the other hand, when the education and youth services budget is cut, everyone rushes around trying to find alternatives. It won't work. There is no substitute for the society's commitment expressed through Government intervention to the education of intellectually capable, democratic and socially responsible human beings.

The Ypsilanti Study on the long-term impact of preschool education and many other studies demonstrate conclusively the power which our educational system possesses.

Unless there is a struggle to make the Federal Government assume the responsibility of education, which only the Federal Government can adequately implement, we are condemned to stand by helplessly as our young people's lives are flushed away.

Whom do we include in this struggle?

Is the problem of a 49-percent high school dropout rate in New York City exclusively an urban problem?

Are the problems of poor school achievement, drug abuse, and youth crime minority problems, although minority youth are overrepresented statistically?

We think that the problems defined by the Committee on Education and Labor are national problems, affecting all of us in different ways and with varying degrees of sharpness.

From our point of view, anyone is an ally who wants a more democratic society. We cannot permit the issue of Federal support for public education to be restricted to a minority issue, or an issue for the poor. It is a question of what kind of society we all will live in—and that is everyone's problem.

We are pleased to have the opportunity to speak at this hearing. The fact that it is being held offers a signpost as to what road we need to take. We cannot let the compromisers and the ones who would go with things as they are to set our agenda.

It is your responsibility as elected officials to do more than vote right. It is the responsibility to educate parents, community residents, even students, and to help organize and create vehicles which gives direction to our struggle.

As Federal representatives you have a special responsibility: that is to bring together your broad, national perspective and understanding of the role of the Federal Government must play in guaranteeing education, with the local organizations and mobilizations you represent. Together, we can revitalize and sustain the vision of a more democratic society and an educational system that is part of that vision.

Ms. BERRY. I would just like to add one other thing before you go on, Congressman.

The United Community Centers has asked senior citizens from our community in East New York, district 19, to come down today just to be here to hear me speak, because we feel that they are direct recipients of what is not the best kind of education that our kids are receiving. And they live in a community where they know that kids who do not go to school, who hang out in their hallways, who hang out on the street corner when they go to the store to buy food, or a newspaper, or whatever, are the kinds of kids who should be in school. And the responsibility of the Federal Government and the Board of Education should be to make sure that all of our kids get an education. So these are our seniors that we brought here today.

Mr. OWENS. I would like to have the record show that although Yvonne Berry spoke last, she is not least. She brought a delegation from the United Community Centers, mostly senior citizens, who are very concerned about children's education because it has a direct impact on the quality of their lives.

I also want to note that, Ms. Berry, your testimony is a fitting conclusion to a very good day of testimonies. I think your very philosophical statement is a good way to end. I am sorry that the chairman could not hear the passion and the concern in your voice. The chairman and a few other members had to leave in order to catch a train back to Washington, and he asked me to extend his apologies. However, he does have copies of your testimony and, of course, all of the testimony will be entered into the record.

I would like to ask a few questions just to clarify a few things and to help get some further information on the record.

I take it, Mr. Brewer, that the flexibility of chapter 2 has been a great boon for your State—it has been a great help. You don't have any problem with that flexibility.

On the other hand, Ms. Abdur-Rahman speaks of the flexibility as having been a problem. And I wonder if she could elaborate—tell me whether or not there are available right now statistics which show to what degree the areas of greatest need have lost in cities like New York where the spreadout, the option to spend the funds and spread them out throughout the whole city regardless of need, has led to losses in the areas of greatest need.

Are there any quantifiable arguments there, any statistics that are available which show the degree to which those school districts or areas have lost? And I think if they are available, the committee would find them useful, to be included in the record. If you have them now, they could be included. If not, if you would forward them to us later, I think it would be very useful.

Ms. ABDUR-RAHMAN. I don't have a great deal of statistical information but I am certain that it is—we can pull some additional materials together for you to send to you.

One thing that I can say, because it is mentioned here in the testimony, our concern with the use of public dollars in private schools—and that is certainly an area where we have seen a shift in local funding, that about $6 million, my staff person tells me——

Mr. OWENS. That was the second question I was going to ask you. First, the spreadout——

Ms. ABDUR-RAHMAN [continuing]. Has gone to private schools.

Mr. OWENS [continuing]. To all schools, and then the degree to which private schools have captured money from the public schools.

Ms. ABDUR-RAHMAN. The inclusion of private schools in funding is one area where you can see a significant shift in local dollars here in New York City.

I should add that this is a problem that we do battle with the State legislature over as well, so our argument is not only with the Federal Government and this loosening of guidelines and moving away from the targeting of funding. And with it happening in funding from more than one source, it merely exacerbates the problem. When we have received dropout money, for example, recently from the State, and had the guidelines drawn so loosely, that those dollars could go to school districts that had basically 98 percent attendance every day in the same proportions almost as they go to districts, you know, that have 30 percent truancy rates, or higher. And this is what is happening from that Federal——

Mr. OWENS. And does that in fact occur? Do you have some figures on that?

Ms. ABDUR-RAHMAN. Well, that's a State program, not Federal. But I am just saying that because it is happening, it is all attributable to a loosening of guidelines and moving away from targeting that has been true of both Federal and State dollars, and has exacerbated the situation in New York, and we can document that to you.

Mr. OWENS. Do you think the Federal Government should be concerned about the way State and local governments allocate

their funds? For example, in New York City, is the amount spent per pupil the same in all of the school districts of the city?

Ms. ABDUR-RAHMAN. No, it is not. And because most States use some type of wealth measure, whether it's local property taxes, income taxes, or income earned, there is some kind of wealth measure used for formulating distribution of local school aid dollars. And so long as we are using that kind of measurement or determination, you will have inequities between districts where there are a greater concentration of poor people and unemployed people and more affluent districts.

So there is a wide disparity in districts in New York State.

Mr. OWENS. New York City, as far as the State is concerned, is one school district.

Ms. ABDUR-RAHMAN. Right.

Mr. OWENS. So within that one school district from subareas to subareas, is the same amount of money spent per pupil, and should the Federal Government be concerned with that kind of fairness in the expenditure of funds?

Ms. ABDUR-RAHMAN. I think the Federal Government should be concerned because even within New York City, our five boroughs, for some programs the boroughs are sometimes taken as individual school districts, and at other times the city as a whole is considered.

So, quite frankly, we reach a situation where students in some parts of the city are worth more in terms of dollars than students in other parts of the city. And it has more to do with the income property values, and so forth, often than—I mean, the kids basically are all alike, they are students, students from Staten Island, and students in the Bronx, are students, and need the same basic amount of support for an education. But they do bring in different amounts of dollars.

Mr. OWENS. Well, just one in the same vein. It has been rumored that there are certain districts that have far more experienced teachers. As a result of the higher salaries, there is a great skewing of the amount of money spent per district. Is that true? Are there figures to back that up? The expenditure per pupil is greatly skewed as a result.

Ms. ABDUR-RAHMAN. Yes, that is certainly true. There are schools—it's true at the high school level and for elementary and junior high schools—there are districts in New York City where, because of a wide range of other problems in that district—they have a more rapid turnover of teachers, they tend to have more inexperienced teachers, and teachers newly entering the system. And you have other districts where there is a more stable teaching force who also earn annual increments in salaries. So the cost of hiring teachers and what you are buying for that money can differ greatly from one district to another.

Mr. OWENS. Finally, Ms. Berry, the chancellor pointed out earlier that 75 percent of the New York City students go on to college, graduates go to college.

And this particular school, 80 percent of the graduates go to college, and 75 percent citywide. I thought I knew a lot about New York City education—I found that shocking.

From your description of what is going on in the schools, would you agree that 75 percent of our graduates go to college?

Ms. BERRY. I would have to say, Congressman, that from my point of view, many of the kids who do go on to college are lacking. And we don't know how many percentage of those kids that go on to college stay there.

I know, for instance, my daughter was a product of the New York City public school system—suffered many losses going through public schools. And she was one of the students who was going through some of the best programs, supposedly, in the New York City public school system, and she lost out a great deal. I know there was a lack of science.

She is now at the State University at New Paltz—and I know the things that's deficient. And she is one among many, and she has mentioned that many kids came out of her district, district 19, and went to Thomas Jefferson, and other schools around the city, who are taking remediation course—and some of them have not lasted.

So, he may say that 75 percent go on to college, but we don't know how many stay there for how long, and due to their poor academic skills.

Mr. OWENS. Do any of these organizations have any figures that show how many students who enter college stay there for a year, or beyond? Or any statistics available to show how many students coming out of the New York City schools enter college and stay there for more than a year?

Ms. BERRY. That I don't know. But we also have to consider that there is a large dropout rate. So, really, when he talks about 75 percent, I am not sure who he is talking about. I really don't know.

Mr. OWENS. You are not sure what the definition of graduate is?

Ms. ABDUR-RAHMAN. If I can add a comment to that. I think there are two other factors that the committee needs to take into consideration, and one is the dropout rate. So talking about 75 percent of graduates going to college is certainly not talking about 75 percent of the students who enter New York City high schools and are on record there from ninth grade—I mean, we lose half of them between 9 grade and 12 grade.

So you are talking about 75 percent, maybe, of 50 percent of the eligible population.

And the second thing is that nationwide, all colleges just about report nearly a 50-percent dropout rate of their freshmen classes. And New York City's average is higher than that.

Mr. OWENS. I would be interested in having any figures and statistics you have to support that forwarded to the committee.

Thank you very much.

[The information referred to follows:]

EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES PANEL,
INTERFACE, STAFF,
New York, NY 10010, February 26, 1985.

Hon. MAJOR R. OWENS,
289 Utica Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11213

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OWENS: I appreciated the opportunity to testify at last week's hearing before the House Committee on Education and Labor. As you requested, I am enclosing some additional information on the impact of the Reagan education cuts and the inequities in city funding for high schools.

Thank you for your support for public education and your efforts on behalf of the citys young people.

Sincerely,

AMINA ABDUR-RAHMAN,
Coordinator.

Enclosures.

A. HIGH SCHOOL ALLOCATIONS—$15 MILLION

While high schools have been the focus of the national debate surrounding education, they are the one area that has been overlooked by the Executive Budget.

This is not to denigrate the crucial importance of early grades. The members of the Educational Priorities Panel have always supported initiatives in the early grades. As the Mayor points out in the budget message, "Reduced class sizes in the early, formative years with an emphasis on the basics is the single most important thing we can do to help our children learn to read, write and do math—the skills they must have to lead productive, independent lives." However, that is not the end of our responsibility; there is much more that we must teach our young people, many more experiences they must explore as they mature and build upon those basic skills. No youngster will succeed without the fundamental tools of learning, but few will be able to succeed if their education is neglected in later years.

There are two major imperatives for supporting our city's high schools. First, in their own right, high schools are the appropriate arenas for adolescents to develop their skills, explore various subjects and prepare for future employment and further education. In addition, New York City high schools are bearing the burden of the results of the fiscal crisis. It is these students in high school today who lost 90 minutes of instruction from their first and second grade classes each week. The same young people who bore the service cuts and increased class size, the young people who never received that "single most important thing" that the Mayor believes we should do to help our children, are now fifteen and sixteen years old, and only half of them can be expected to even graduate from high school.

High school services must be improved. A few statistics will demonstrate the job ahead in combatting the effects of the fiscal crisis:

From fall 1973 to fall 1977, the ratio of students to teachers in academic schools increased by 26.6 percent;

During the same period, the ratio of students to teachers in vacational schools increased by 32.5 percent;

From fall 1973 to fall 1983, average class size in academic schools rose by 16.6 percent and by 17.9 percent in vocational schools. There are currently more than 12,000 classes with more than 34 students (the contractual limit);

During the same ten-year period, while graduation requirements for high school students increased, funding per high school student decreased by 5 percent in academic schools and 7.8 percent vocational schools (measured in constant units);

In 1983–84, the Program to Raise Educational Performance (PREP) was mounted to assist students reading below grade level. While the program had numerous start-up problems, these became insurmountable due to a lack funding. More than $2.9 million was shifted away from other remedial programs, and even this "robbing Peter to pay Paul," there were never adeqaute funds for the program design.

It is clear that we must rebuild the high schools, but not just to mirror the system of 1974. Those high schools were better staffed, but they had problems as well. The Educational Priorities Panel has studied the high schools in depth, beginning with a 1979 study of the allocation of funds to individual high schools. There are two key ingredients to improving the high schools. First, principals must have the authority and flexibility to develop appropriate and successful programs for students in their schools. Our high school population includes students at every academic level, interested in every conceivable vocation, brought up in dozens of different ethnic communities. No program developed centrally, as if by cookie cutter, and distributed to over one hundred high schools will succeed. Of course, school programs must be closely monitored and they must meet specific standards. (The State Education Department is now preparing to implement the standards of the new Regents Action Plan and the accompanying technical assistance.) However, principals, in conjunction with their staff, must take the lead, as is demonstrated by the literature on school improvement.

The second issue is a specific question of budget and appropriations. The high school allocation formula must be equitable and provide incentives to develop necessary services and successful program approaches. The current formula des not meet

these criteria and must be reformed in conjunction with the addition of new funds. Additional dollars should be used to reduce class size and increase guidance and support services. However, the current formula discourages both of these initiatives, and worse, it does not comply with basic notions of equity.

What Is Wrong With the Way We Fund Our High Schools?

The Board of Education uses a formula to allocate funds to each of the city's high schools. The formula has numerous factors to measure how much money a school needs to continue the current level of services. However, there are several major problems. First of all, in many schools, the current level is inadequate. While one school offers every student at least seven courses daily including a wide range of electives, another barely offers anyone six classes and there is little variety or specialization among the required survey English and history courses.

In 1979, the EPP released its first study of this allocation formula. At that time, the best-funded school received one unit (equivalent to the average teacher's salary) for every 14.45 students, while another school received only one unit for every 22.63 students (see Table 1). These figures reflect total tax levy funding, both formula units and additional discrete (or discretionary) funds, granted by the Executive Director of the High School Division or the Borough Superintendents. However, we found the same disparities whether we analyzed total funding or only the funds generated by the formula: in either case the best-funded school received 57–58 percent more than the poorest school.

TABLE 1

	Total net units: actual registers		Formula units: estimated allotment registers	
	Fall 1977	Fall 1983	Fall 1978	Fall 1983
Minimum	1 U./22.63 Students	1 U./22.54 S.	1U./25.45 Students	1 U./22.05 S.
Maximum	1 U./14.45 Students	1 U./11.08 S.[1]	1U./16.10 Students	1 U./14.91 S.
Weighted mean	1 U./19.51 Students	1 U./18.36 S.	1U./21.31 Students	1 U./18.94 S.
	Difference between worst and best-funded schools (percent)			
	0057	0103 [1]	058	048
	Difference between worst-funded and mean (percent)			
	035	023	019	016.4

[1] This best-funded school, when discretionary units are considered, is A. Philip Randolph, a small, relatively new school. The second school, Alexander Hamilton, receives one unit for every 12.33 students, which is still a difference of 83%.

Since that time, we have worked with the High School Division. While they have never accepted our recommendation for a complete overhaul of the formula, to the credit of staff at the Division, there have been reforms. The disparity between the best- and least-funded schools has been reduced in terms of formula units to 48 percent—a significant decreases but still an unacceptable inequity. However, if we include discretionary funds, the difference grows to 103 percent! In fall 1983, the mean or average level of funding for a high school, based only on formula units, was one unit for every 18.94 students. Schools ranged from one unit for every 14.91 students up to one unit for every 22.05 students.[1] Total tax levy funding, including discrete units, ranged from one unit for every 11.08 students to one unit for every 22.54 students. Focusing on the formula itself, 43 schools are funded below the average. It would require 352.88 units, or $11,115,567[2] just to bring these schools up to the average.

[1] These figures do not include Manhanttan Center for Arts and Sciences and the High School for the Humanities. These two schools are new and very small; their funding, with high start-up costs, would further skew the results. Alternatives schools are also not included. They are funded at a strict per capita rate of one unit per 16 students.

[2] This figure assumes the current average high school teacher's salary, $31,500, and does not include fringe benefits. Significant additions of new high school teachers with these funds would decrease the average salary, even with the budgeted two percent increase as a result of a new contract.

The impact of these funding levels is not entirely random. Tables 2,3, 4 and 5 list the best-funded and worst-funded schools. The best-funded schools are almost exlusively vocational. This is a result of a factor in the formula that recognizes the class size limit of 28 for shop classes (as opposed to 34 for regular classes). While our vocational schools are hardly basking in riches, this one provision, combined with federal VEA funds for equipment and supplies allows them to provide programs which attract students and achieves better attendance and lower dropout rates. Of course, money alone, especially when better-funded still means a shoe-string budget, is not the answer. Not every vocational school meets our standards of excellence. However, there is a strong correlation between funding, program, and performance. All of the poorly-funded schools are academic/comprehensive schools, without many of the resources the special and vocational schools have to develop special programs to attract and motivate students. Of the 15 poorest-funded schools on Table 5, 13 have dropout rates higher than either their borough or the citywide average. Similar relationships are evident if we exmaine attendance rates or measures of academic achievement.

TABLE 2.—BEST-FUNDED SCHOOLS, 1983—ONE UNIT FOR EVERY 16.2 STUDENTS OR BETTER

[Total net units—Including discretionary units from the borough superintendent or executive director and school aide hours]

Name of high school	Number of students per 1 unit	Type of school
1. A. Philip Randolph	11.08	Academic.
2. Alexander Hamilton	12.33	Vocational.
3. Manhattan Vocational	12.41	Do.
4. Aviation	14.18	Do.
5. Ralph McKee	14.26	Do.
6. Bay Ridge	14.67	Academic.
7. Alfred E. Smith	14.89	Vocational.
8. Mabel Dean Bacon	15.18	Do.
9. Queens Vocational	15.22	Do.
10. George Westinghouse	15.50	Do.
11. Fiorello H. LaGuardia	15.61	Performing arts/music and art.
12. Samuel Gompers	15.61	Vocational
13. Chelsea	15.70	Do.
14. Automotive	15.76	Do.
15. Thomas A. Edison	16.17	Do.
16. H.S. of Graphic Communications Arts	16.20	Do.

TABLE 3.—WORST-FUNDED SCHOOLS, 1983—ONE UNIT FOR EVERY 19.9 STUDENTS OR WORSE

[Total net units—Including discretionary units from the borough superintendent or executive director and school aide hours]

Name of high school	Number of students per 1 unit	Type of school
1. F.K. Lane	22.54	Academic.
2. Walton	21.65	Do.
3. Eastern District	21.45	Do.
4. Fort Hamilton	21.33	Do.
5. Evander Childs	21.08	Do.
6. Julia Richman	21.03	Do.
7. Boys and Girls	20.85	Do.
8. South Shore	20.66	Do.
9. Adlai E. Stevenson	20.54	Do.
10. Martin Luther King, Jr	20.46	Do.
11. Springfield Gardens	20.17	Do.
12. George Washington	20.10	Do.
13. John Jay	20.07	Do.
14. Christopher Columbus	20.06	Do.
15. Erasmus Hall	19.91	Do.

TABLE 4.—BEST-FUNDED SCHOOLS, 1983—ONE UNIT FOR EVERY 16 STUDENTS OR BETTER

(Formula units only)

Name of high school	Number of students per 1 unit	Type of school
1. Aviation	14.91	Vocational (plus additional FAA course requirements).
2. Alexander Hamilton	15.12	Vocational.
3. Queens Vocational	15.45	Do.
4. East New York	16.13	Do.
5. Alfred E. Smith	16.18	Do.
6. South Bronx	16.37	Academic.
7. George Westinghouse	16.56	Vocational.
8. Automotive	16.57	Do.
9. Samuel Gompers	16.60	Do.
10. Ralph McKee	16.70	Do.
11. William E. Grady	16.77	Do.
12. William H. Maxwell	16.84	Do.
13. A. Phillip Randolph	16.85	Relatively new, small school.
14. Chelsea	16.87	Vocational.
15. Bay Ridge	16.94	Academic.
16. Art & Design	16.95	Vocational.
17. John Dewey	16.96	Extended School Day Program.

TABLE 5.—WORST-FUNDED SCHOOLS, 1983—ONE UNIT FOR EVERY 20 STUDENTS OR WORSE

(Formula units only)

Name of high school	Number of students per 1 unit	Type of school
1. Thomas Jefferson	22.05	Zoned Academic.
2. Julia Richman	21.66	Do.
3. Walton	21.58	Do.
4. John F. Kennedy	21.52	Do.
5. Franklin K. Lane	21.47	Do.
6. Evander Childs	21.33	Do.
7. John Jay	20.78	Do.
8. South Shore	20.60	Do.
9. Christopher Columbus	20.43	Do.
10. George Washington	20.42	Do.
11. Theodore Roosevelt	20.39	Do.
12. Fort Hamilton	20.38	Do.
13. DeWitt Clinton	20.32	Do.
14. Seward Park	20.19	Do.
15. Washington Irving	20.09	Do.

However, though dollars are needed, they are not the total answer to formula reform. The current formula has a second flaw. It is based on the "curriculum index," the average number of academic classes taken by students each day. This factor in the formula is an incentive to increase class size and therefore accommodate more students at less cost with greater reimbursement. It also discourages the offering of advanced classes or specialized courses which do not attract large numbers of students, and the addition of staff to provide guidance and support services. And since classes are crammed, school staff is disinclined to strive for full attendance. Anyway, schools cannot afford to spend funds on attendance teachers, family workers, and guidance because the formula does not fully account for the costs of those kinds of staff. The mathematics of the formula means that if one unit is used to hire a teacher to teach five periods with 34 students in each class, the next year that one unit turns into 1.13 units. However, if one unit is used to hire a vocational counselor and students spend afternoons at a work site, the school will lose funds the next year. Losses will likewise be incurred if a teacher-coordinator is given time

to reach out to business to idenfiy job opportunities or develop a new program geared to current employer needs. Thus, it is no surprise that we have oversized classes and frustrated students and teachers.

The answer is a switch to a per capita funding formula. This would provide roughly equivalent funding for each student for whatever services are most appropriate and not prescribe one narrow approach for high school programs. Unfortunately, the breadth of the exising inequity makes it impossible to correct the problem at once. The EPP suggests a three-year program to convert to a per capita formula and improve funding and services at all high schools. We should begin this year with $15 million, $11 million to bring the poorest schools to this year's average per capita funding and $4 million to allow the remaining schools to increase services and begin to provide the high standard of services necessary.

CHART E.—FEDERAL CUTS

[In millions]

Program	New York City 1981–82	New York City 1982–83	Net Loss	
Chapter I (formerly title I).	$147.0	$139.3	$7.7	Chapter I (formerly title I): Title I programs provide remedial services in reading, math, writing and bilingual education, as well as related supportive services, to economically and educationally disadvantaged students. The programs are coordinated with New York State-funded programs for Pupils with Special Educational Needs (PSEN), which also supports, in part, the Promotional Gates program in grades 4 and 7. The cut in Title I funds will result in: serving fewer eligible students in need of remediation; watering down of services provided to those still included in the program; and cuts in staff, including teachers and especially paraprofessionals, since more paraprofessionals are paid from Title I funds than any other source; and redeploying the coordinated use of Title I and PSEN funds, thereby leaving less PSEN money to support the Promotional Gates classes. The achievement gains of participating students in Title I programs have been instrumental in citywide increases in reading and math scores. A cut of this size would slow recent gains in overall student achievement.
Chapter II	[1] 28.0	8.8	19.2	Chapter II. This new block grant consolidates 28 categorial programs which provided funds primarily on a competitive basis, for specific program purposes. Among these were integration support services, (Emergency School Aid Act), library and instructional resources (ESEA title IVB), staff development (Teacher Corps and Teacher Centers), basic skills (ESEA title II), innovative programs (ESEA title IV-C) and others. Districts in New York City competed actively and successfully for these funds over the years. Now, Chapter II funds will be allocated statewide on an enrollment basis, thereby providing funds to hundreds of districts around the state which never competed for funds from antecedent programs, and to non-public schools, which will also receive a large share of the monies based upon enrollment factors. The reduction in funding level and the termination of specific program services will impact most severely on those districts which received ESAA funding to support their integration efforts. These individual district grants averaged $500,000–$1,000,000.

[1] Average funding for FY 1979—FY 1981
Source: Federal School Funding: Does New York Stand a Chance? Educational Priorities Panel, November 1981.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF AMINA ABDUR-RAHMAN, COORDINATOR, EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES PANEL, NEW YORK, NY

Good afternoon. I am Amina Abdur-Rahman, Coordinator of the Educational Priorities Panel here in New York City. The EPP is a nine-year-old coalition of 24

major parent and civic organizations that monitors the spending and management practices of the New York City Board of Education in order to ensure that public school children receive the maximum benefit possible from the almost four billion dollars spent on public education in New York City. In practice that means that we seek to make sure that dollars are spent effectively and efficiently, that administrative costs are kept to a minimum, and that the highest quality instructional and support services for children are the top priority in school budget decision-making. Since financial issues are our focus, I am here today to speak mainly about the federal government's fiscal responsibilities in the area of public education. The EPP was forged out of the fiscal turmoil that descended upon the city in 1975, when municipal services were being drastically slashed to balance the budget, and public school children were being asked to bear more than their fair share of the burden.

Who are the public school children of New York City? By any definition, they are a diverse and a disadvantaged population. As an indication, 95 percent of the lunches served in New York City public schools are free or reduced price. Twenty percent of New York City's children live in poverty by federal standards, compared with 13 percent nationwide. Fifty-five percent live in female-headed households; English is a foreign language for about a third of the 945,000 students; 73 percent are members of racial minority groups; and almost 12 percent have handicapping conditions. Almost half are reading below grade level and also almost half (probably the same half) will never complete high school. For minority students, the proportion of dropouts soars to over 60 percent, by most estimates.

Primary responsibility for educating these children, by virtue of our constitutional system, lies with the State of New York. Nevertheless, New York State pays for less than 40 percent of the cost. The federal role in education has been large in policy and direction, but minuscule in financing. For reasons of economics and international competition, funds were provided for vocational education. After Sputnik, math and science programs were given increased support. In the sixties, we saw a shift to an emphasis on equality of opportunity, as the federal government recognized that it was the protector of last resort for the disadvantaged and the powerless who were being denied equal access to locally-provided services. In both of these roles, there was a clear right to federal involvement, and a need for federal funding, because the national interest was at stake. The members of the Educational Priorities Panel maintain that the federal government must not retreat from its responsibility to ensure that students with special needs receive necessary services.

In the last year, we have seen, once again, the awakening of a nationwide concern about education and a recognition that once again our economic and technological standing in the world market is threatened. We are now at a crucial crossroads. The decisions you make will determine the future for public school students, particularly in the nation's large cities. As has been noted recently by the National Coalition of Advocates for Students, this national movement could have the potential for restricting the rights and opportunities of disadvantaged students if their needs are overlooked. On the other hand, it could expand their opportunities if every effort is made to bring them along on the quest for excellence.

Unfortunately, at the present time, it is the former outcome that seems more likely because, unlike prior movements, the national shift in educational policy is being accompanied by a rather perverse shift in fiscal policy. While national commissions are calling for major new financial commitments ot upgrading our schools, the Administration in Washington has been seeking to reduce its support or public education. Without the necessary additional resources, there is no doubt that the students who need the most help to meet tougher course requirements will be the ones to be neglected and left behind. We need action from this Administration, not cheerleading. Perhaps it is this contradiction between the clear national priority for better schooling and this trend in national financial policy that recently led John Brademas, President of New York University, to characterize the Administration's efforts to cut federal education spending as a "mindless shifting of federal responsibility." According to figures released by the National Education Association, federal aid as a proportion of total school spending has fallen to its lowest level since the 1960's, to 6.4 percent from a 1980 high of 9.2 percent. Certainly, if our desire for better schools is sincere, such a shift is indeed mindless.

Furthermore, cuts in education aid do not tell the whole story. Reductions in child health and nutrition programs, in employment training, mental health and income support will all affect the ability of children to learn in school. Furthermore, they will disproportionately affect the children in New York City, were 30 percent receive AFDC (compared to 12 percent nationwide) and there is room in publicly-funded day care facilities for only 40 percent of those eligible.

Between the 1980–81 school year and last year, federal funds dropped from 15.5 percent to only 11.5 percent of the city's education expenditures. During that same four-year period, federal funds increased by less than five percent, while the city raised its support for public education by almost 50 percent! Thanks to the work of this Committee specific programs have been maintained. And federal funding, always far short of meeting the cost of federal mandates, did not suffer the actual reductions proposed by the President. Specifically, Chapter I aid for disadvantaged students has recently increased following funding cuts in 1982. However, thousands of eligible students remain unserved.

With the help of this subcommittee the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act is a significant step by the federal government to earmark funds to serve special populations. We applaud the set asides for disadvantaged, Limited English Proficient and Handicapped Students, all of whom are underserved in city vocational and occupational programs. Money designated for sex equity purposes is very much needed in New York City where training opportunities for female students remain extremely limited. Most of these students are enrolled in schools which only offer training for stereotypically female jobs which offer low pay and little hope of advancement. Only 7.6 percent of female students are enrolled in traditionally male training programs. The rest of the young women are segregated into five of the city's 20 vocational high schools. To ensure implementation of the mandated set-asides, there must be an appropriation to fund both basic services and the provisions designed to increase access to underserved populations.

The elimination of Impact Aid, which most people think of as benefitting districts with military bases, caused the loss of $23 million because of New York City's many federal housing projects. Bilingual aid, too, has fallen, despite the fact that New York City is still the nation's primary recipient of immigrants. Our public schools serve more than *50* different language groups, and we provide bilingual or ESL instruction for *13* of them.

The one aid category that has grown is aid for children with handicapping conditions—from $13 to $20.5 million. However, the actual aid per student has dropped since New York City is now providing special education to more than twice as many students. This is a cruel hoax, compared to the level of aid originally authorized under the Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. This law, while mandating a much-needed range of services for these children, anticipated and authorized a federal funding role of 40 percent of costs. Ten years later, appropriations have never covered more than eight percent of costs in New York City, while we are serving about three times as many of the underserved students as we did in 1975. In fact, many experts are attributing the growing number of referrals to special education to the fact that the regular education system is starved for the kinds of support services, small classes and alternative programs that the special education system is mandated to provide. It is time for the federal government to provide sufficient funds to serve all eligible students in federal programs.

Finally, Chapter 2, which represents dozens of categorical programs now consolidated into a single block grant, has also shrunk by about 15 percent, although the anticipated administrative savings from consolidation never really materialized. The effect of this cut on disadvantaged children was exacerbated by changes in regulations that allowed the funds to be distributed citywide, including private schools and more affluent districts, rather than being targeted to the neediest areas. According to the National Committee for Citizens in Education, only 17 states are now directing Chapter 2 funds to high-need districts.

That is the status of federal education funding. Although the President's proposals for Federal Fiscal Year 1986 do not include cuts for elementary and secondary education, this is not the full story. As I noted, New York City has used its local tax revenues to support education in light of federal cuts. However, as explained by the Mayor in his testimony before the Budget Committee, New York City is slated to lose substantial revenues for housing, transportation, and economic development in the President's proposals. We cannot plug all of these holes. It will be impossible for the city to continue to increase education funds at a time when other city services are suffering.

I would like to mention two other issues before closing. The members of the EPP are unanimous in our belief that public funds ought to be devoted to public education and we will oppose any legislative efforts to undermine that principle. Particularly at a time when federal support for public education is declining, there is no rationale for introducing tax credits to support private education.

Finally, Title IX of the education amendments of 1972 is the only federal law against sex discrimination in education. Since its passage 13 years ago, Title IX has been the catalyst for dramatic gains in educational opportunities for women and

girls. However, efforts to remove sex discrimination from schools must continue with the help of active federal enforcement. As a result of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Grove City* v. *Bell*, Title IX enforcement activity has been significantly narrowed or halted completely. We urge you to support legislation to restore the original Congressional intent to prohibit sex discrimination in our nation's schools.

In closing, we in New York are ready to take up the challenge to improve public education. We have increased the budget, we have undertaken new initiatives and we are responding to the new standards enacted by the state regents. The Educational Priorities Panel represents consumers of public education who are also, as taxpayers, the funders of our schools. We will continue to monitor the NYC Board of Education and make sure that promises and budget increases are translated into the highest quality education for our students. You must join us in this effort. The federal government cannot abdicate its role in preparing young people for the future.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Jeffords?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you. Unfortunately, the last panel is always the one that has trouble with the time. I have to run and make a plane, too, and it is not fair because we ran over before we got to you.

I just would like to say that I think the differences of the problems in the sense of the rural and urban areas come together when it comes to problems of education and resources. And I think it has been brought out by both Dr. Brewer and the other members of this panel that there is a Federal role in trying to do what we can to try and even out the resource problems that there are.

It is always staggering for me to come to New York City and to learn about the number of dropouts—the percentage of dropouts—even though that 75 percent sounds good. If you take 75 percent of 50 percent, you are, I think, well below the national average. And if you take 50 percent of that, that drop out of college, you are talking about a small percentage of your entering students that actually go on. And that is a very alarming rate.

I have been concerned what I have heard today about, especially the declining number of minorities which are ending up in college now as against a few years ago. These are very important things.

Dr. Brewer, I appreciate you bringing to this panel at the time we were listening to the horrendous problems of the inner cities, some of those which are perhaps not quite as horrendous, but still very difficult problems of the rural areas. And I thank you very much for your testimony.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OWENS. I want to thank the members of the audience, some of whom have been here all day, and say that this concludes the hearings here in New York City. Thank you very much.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I speak on behalf of the committee to thank everyone that was here today, and let it be known that the chairman asked to let it be known that the record is open. Anyone that wants to provide further information on any of the questions asked, or anyone else here who desires to participate in these hearings by providing written information to the panel, it would be very deeply appreciated. Again, thank you, and certainly the members of your district—Mr. Major, that came down here to listen to the very fine testimony of Yvonne.

[Whereupon, at 3:10 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

[Material submitted for inclusion in the record follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COALITION OF TITLE I CHAPTER 1 PARENTS BY PAUL WECKSTEIN, DIRECTOR OF WASHINGTON OFFICE, CENTER FOR LAW AND EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. The National Coalition of Title I Chapter 1 Parents is very pleased to be able to participate in your important work to develop legislation to assist in school improvement efforts. Although we have not been able to testify orally at your recent hearings on school improvement legislation, we appreciate this opportunity to do so in writing. Our comments will reflect our interest in three of the bills presently under consideration by the Committee.

The three bills, The American Defense Education Act (H.R. 650), the Secondary Schools Basic Skills Act (H.R. 901), and the Effective Schools Development in Education Act (H.R. 747), establish the forum for important debate and the development of ideas on the role the federal government will play in the future of education.

As an organization whose major focus is the education of disadvantaged children and the involvement of their parents, the Coalition believes that additional federal initiatives are greatly needed in this area and applaud your efforts. Our comments are intended to help arrive at the best possible legislation. With that goal in mind, we wish to present the Committee with a series of questions which we believe should be addressed as the legislation is refined. These questions are particularly intended to focus the Committee's attention on the best way for the legislation to address issues of targeting of funds, achievement expectations, parent and student participation in program governance, and federal oversight.

How, if at all, should funds be targeted toward low-income students and/or to schools with greater economic need?

The American Defense Education Act (ADEA) provides 12.5 percent more funding for low-income students than for other students. However, statistics indicate that this is considerably less than the average extra cost of serving such students. Further, despite this provision to increase the aid to districts with large numbers of low-income students, there is no requirement in the legislation that these students be served once the money is in the district. The Secondary Schools Basic Skills Act (SSBSA), using a variation of the Chapter 1 formula, provides schools with funds that have a high concentration of low-income students, to then be used within the school for low-achieving students, regardless of income. The Effective Schools Development in Education Act (ESDEA) requires that, in distributing funds, consideration be given to the extent to which the funds go to schools in districts with the greatest numbers or percentages of educationally deprived children, with no specific reference to low-income students or a school district's economic needs.

What equity provisions, beyond existing civil rights laws, are needed to protect minority, limited-English-proficient, or handicapped students, or to deal with sex bias?

How, if at all, should a bill describe the skills or subject areas to be covered?

The descriptions of subject areas differ in the three bills under consideration. ADEA refers to math, science, foreign languages, communication skills, and technology. SSBSA refers to the "basic skills of reading, writing, communication and mathematics proficiency." ESDEA refers to "emphasis on basic and higher-order skills".

What must be done to assure that equity for low-income and other underserved student not be limited to equity in the acquisition of "basic" or "elementary level" skills?

Low-income and underserved students' educational opportunities should not be limited. Equity must extend to the teaching and acquisition of more complex and higher-order skills, which include problem-solving and analysis, more advanced math, science and technology. Many education studies have demonstrated that there is a definite relationship between the expectations established for a student and that student's performance. It is important to target improvement programs to performance beyond "basic skills" (or to redefine "basic" to include those higher-order skills).

Should there be a specific focus on secondary schools?

What is the relationship between new legislation and existing legislation?

For ADEA in particular, the question might be, how does this program relate to the Chapter 2 block grant (as well as to the math-science law enacted last year)? Would the block grant be needed if ADEA were enacted and funded? Should some of the new proposed concepts be used to amend the block grant? For SSBSA, the questions revolve around its relation to Chapter 1; should, instead, there be amendments to Chapter 1, and funding increases, to direct or encourage more of its funds to be secondary school level? (Advocates of SSBSA believe that the provision for competi-

tive grant proposals would be a better mechanism than the formula grants under Chapter 1.)

How should new legislation reflect what has been learned from other federal educational programs?

The impact of programs now in effect, both positive and negative, should be evaluated and included in the consideration of any new initiatives. Both categorical (such as Chapter 1) and block grant (such as Chapter 2) programs should be included in this evaluation.

For ADEA, given the absence of federal standards or monitoring provisions, will the bonus for achieving goals serve as an incentive for districts both to set their goals fairly low and to be less than fully candid in reporting their outcomes, discouraging districts from setting high goals for themselves and from openly acknowledging and addressing problems in meeting those goals?

What impact will particular legislation have on the use of standardized testing in schools?

How should legislation reflect research and evaluation findings on school improvement effort?

Should legislation encourage school-based management?

The shift in power away from the federal government has resulted in considerable tension between various levels of school governance. Provisions in any new legislation should take into account the impact of such legislation on state versus central district office versus individual school level and classroom decision-making.

To the extent that legislation is intended to enhance local decision-making, what should it contain to assure that the decision-making is broad-based and participatory, particularly in terms of parents?

A general requirement to consult with parents in program development (provided in ADEA and SSBSA) will not by itself be effective. Such requirements, standing alone, have failed to produce real involvement in most districts, and past federal studies have shown that effective involvement usually requires specific, clear mandates setting forth parents' rights and providing for parents' needs for support. If the Committee wants to take meaningful action on parent involvement, it will have to address carefully the barriers which parents have faced. Some attention should be given to two federal programs which have had more successful parent involvement—Head Start, in which a parent group has actual sign-off authority on program decisions, and handicapped programs, in which parents must help develop and must approve individualized education plans and in which some federal grants are now provided directly to parent-controlled groups for parent training.

At the secondary level, what provisions should be included to assure effective student consultation and involvement?

As with parents, a general mandate alone will not suffice.

What kinds of local, state, and federal evaluation, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms should be required? Should the students for whom the program is intended, and their parents, have any roles or rights in enforcement?

The legislation also must assure that any such mechanisms—for example, the provisions in SSBSA for NIE monitoring, evaluation, and technical assistance and for a demonstration component—have adequate staff and funding support.

Mr. Chairman, we hope these questions are helpful as you and your Committee continue your consideration of these three proposals and any others that may come before you. We are looking forward to working with you as the debate continues, and supporting your efforts to develop the legislation in this critical area.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RHODA SCHULZINGER, STAFF DIRECTOR, FULL ACCESS AND RIGHTS TO EDUCATION COALITION, NEW YORK, NY

My name is Rhoda Schulzinger and I am staff director of the Full Access and Rights to Education (FARE) Coalition. FARE is a coalition of thirty organizations and individuals throughout New York City who work to promote sex equity in education and employment training programs. I want to address four areas in which there is a need for strong federal legislation and aid: Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; vocational education, the Women's Educational Equity Act Program; and programs to address the problems associated with teenage pregnancy.

FARE's work is based on the premise that there is a strong relationship between quality and equity in education. We believe that there is crucial connection between providing equal opportunities in the classroom and achieving full potential later in life. FARE is particularly concerned about educational opportunities for young women at a time when nine out of ten girls can expect to work outside the home at

some point in their lives. Furthermore, the number of women who are responsible for their own economic welfare and for that of their children continues to increase rapidly. At the same time, women continue to be locked into low-paying, dead end jobs and as a result, two out of three poor adults are women. FARE believes that to address this situation, commonly known as "the feminization of poverty", women must have access to all educational and employment training programs.

This subcommittee now has the opportunity to affirm its commitment to equal opportunity for female students by supporting the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1985. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is the only federal law against sex discrimination in education. Since its passage thirteen years ago, Title IX has been the catalyst for dramatic gains in educational opportunities for women and girls. However, the effort to remove sex discrimination from schools must continue.

Despite the passage of Title IX, women and girls still face institutional barriers to sex equity. For example, in New York City.

In the City's nineteen vocational high schools, males predominate at the ten schools which offer training in higher paying occupations. While students at the primarily male schools study electronics and computer servicing, the five primarily female schools offer cosmetology, health assistance and clerical programs. Even in the few vocational schools with a more even balance between males and females, boys are overwhelmingly found in high technology programs while girls prepare to be stenographers and dental aides.

Title IX mandates the designation of personnel in all schools to coordinate anti-sex discrimination efforts. However, these coordinators generally have numerous other duties which hinder attention to equity efforts, and students and teachers often do not even know who has responsibility to address sex discrimination problems.

While City schools completed self evaluations as mandated by Title IX, there have been only sporadic attempts over the years to develop any remediation plans. Consequently, the Board of Education has no official statistical documentation of the extent of sex discrimination throughout the school system. However, FARE and other advocacy groups have collected evidence of sex discrimination in employment practices, guidance practices and athletics.

Clearly, there is still an urgent need for strong federal enforcement to prohibit sex discrimination in schools. However, as a result of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Grove City College* v. *Bell*, Title IX now only covers specific educational programs which receive direct federal funding. This means that any area of a school that has not received earmarked federal aid can discriminate on the basis of sex while federal funds are used in other parts of the same institution.

This interpretation of Title IX creates a haphazard set of civil rights. The *Grove City* decision has already narrowed the scope of federal enforcement activity or halted it completely. One report indicates that at least 23 civil rights investigations have been closed by the federal government since the decision. Two of these were complaints filed against the New York City public schools. By supporting the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1985, you can restore the original Congressional intent to prohibit sex discrimination in our nation's schools.

There is a second piece of legislation which needs your continued support. With significant input from this subcommittee, the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act is a landmark step by the federal government to meet the special needs of women and girls. Money designated for sex equity purposes is much needed in New York City and States where training opportunities for female students remain extremely limited.

Young women represent only 7.6% of the total enrollment in the City's ten predominantly male vocational high schools. The vast majority of female vocational students in New York City are segregated into five schools which offer training for stereotypically female jobs.

This pattern is repealed throughout New York State where in 1983–84 ten of the major 50 secondary vocational programs are over 90% male. These training programs include electrical occupation, aviation and technical electronics. In contrast, young women represent over 90% of the students enrolled in four of the 50 major programs: medical assisting, secretarial studies, practical nursing and cosmetology.

Having clearly stated your intent to increase access for young women, we urge you to obtain an appropriation which will ensure both implementation of the mandated setasides for special populations and adequate funds for basic services. Last year $950 million was authorized for this bill but only $735 was appropriated. In addition, at the current time, some programs in the new act remain unfunded. To address this problem FARE recommends a supplemental appropriation to more

closely approximate the authorization level. This would both increase the states' ability to maintain status quo programs and to implement the sex equity provisions.

The third program which needs your continued support is the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA). Established in 1974, WEEA funds projects which promote educational equity for girls and women at all levels of the educational system. Programs funded by WEEA have included initiatives designed to train vocational educators to improve access to nontraditional vocational programs, for women and girls materials to train counselors and admissions personnel to overcome sex bias and curriculum materials to meet the needs of women of color and disabled women. The loss of this program would have a harmful affect upon women and girls, and would also severely hamper efforts to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping from public schools.

FARE's fourth concern is the connection between sex bias in education and teenage parenthood. Our educational institutions, among others, are failing to meet the developmental needs of a significant proportion of our young people who then drift into parenthood as a way of escaping their sense of uselessness by securing a valued role for themselves. Sex stereotyping in education constrains young women in their pursuit of personal and vocational interests. This not only contributes to the incidence of teenage parenthood, but also contributes to young mothers' difficulties in achieving economic security. To reduce the incidence of teenage parenthood and to enhance the economic independence of young mothers, FARE recommends that federal aid and legislation should provide resources and set policies to: Enhance the opportunities for all young women to prepare seriously for economic self sufficiency; ensure pregnant students the opportunity to continue their education under circumstances that are appropriate and appealing; and provide young mothers with the support they need to finish school and acquire employment training—such support must include assistance with child care, time management and obtaining the public benefits to which many are entitled.

I urge you to consider these four areas when you review the effectiveness of ongoing programs and future directions for federal aid and legislation. Thank you.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
February 20, 1985.

The Honorable AUGUSTUS HAWKINS,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, 2281 Rayburn Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAWKINS: The Connecticut State Department of Education wishes to provide testimony of the need for ongoing Federal support for equity in education. The Connecticut commitment to sex equity, national origin desegregation, and race desegregation has been supported by grants from the Title IV CRA program since 1976 and has enabled the State Department of Education to provide technical assistance to all local educational agencies on the provision of equal educational opportunities to students without regard to race, sex, or language dominance. Results of such support are clear in the rising test scores across the state. Summary statements of such changes are enclosed.

We are concerned that, of the major education reports published in the past several years, none has addressed the issues of gender disparity or of appropriate education for language minority groups. If federal grants are cut to eliminate state and local programs supporting equity, Connecticut programs designed to achieve excellence will be seriously impaired. Specific conditions of discrimination that would go unaddressed in education without Federal support include training of school staff in the elimination of differential treatment in classrooms, class assignments, and counseling based on sex, race, or language; elimination of biased curricular materials; provision of appropriate career education and career counseling resources; employment; and harassment issues.

Connecticut is committed to and working toward significant equity goals. Federal funds to support these state initiatives have had, and, we hope, will continue to have significant impact on our ability to achieve excellence and equal opportunity for all Connecticut public school students.

Sincerely,

GERALD N. TIROZZI,
Commissioner of Education.

CONNECTICUT WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND LEGAL FUND, INC.
New Haven, CT, February 11, 1985.

Representative AUGUSTUS HAWKINS,
Education and Labor Committee, House of Representatives, 2281 Rayburn Building, Washington, DC

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS, I was pleased to learn that you are holding local public hearings on education. Although I am unable to attend and testify, I would like to offer my comments in this letter.

Improving the quality of education in America must include improving the equality in education, and ensuring equal access to educational oppportunities regardless of sex or race. I am concerned that as we focus attention on the general needs of the educational system, and begin to allocate increasingly scarce public resources, it will become too easy to dismiss sex and race equity programs as "frills" or peripheral programs. I think this would be a grave mistake, and an injustice to all the females and minority students of both sexes who are still struggling for an equal chance to get the skills and training they need to work and participate fully in our society. A discriminatory school system cannot provide a quality education for anyone.

In particular, I urge passage of the 1985 Civil Rights Act. This bill, designed to clarify the broad protection provided by Title IX, Section 504, and the Age Discrimination Act for women, minorities, older people, and the disabled, will help to reverse the damage done by the narrow decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Grove City* v. *Bell.*

Just as important, though, we must protect and perhaps increase the funding for race and sex desegregation centers, Title IV funding for the states, and other programs which target female and minority students.

Women still earn only 60% of what men earn; racial minorities still have disproportionately high rates of unemployment. We cannot let the "discovery" of new issues make us forget about the old ones. Race and sex discrimination have not stopped—we cannot afford to stop our efforts to increase equity and access to a quality education for all students.

Thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

LESLIE BRETT,
Hartford Education Director.

WISCONSIN CONSORTIUM FOR SEX EQUITY IN EDUCATION,
Madison, WI, February 5, 1985.

JACK JENNINGS,
Education and Labor Committee, 2181 Rayburn Bldg., Washington, DC

DEAR MR. JENNINGS: Please include in hearings on equity, access, quality and excellence in education the following testimony from the Wisconsin Consortium for Sex Equity in Education, a grassroots organization composed principally of educators concerned with sex equity in the public schools.

According to research, of the brightest high school graduates who do not go to college, 75–90 percent are women. By the time they are in the fourth grade, girls' perceptions of occupations open to them are largely confined to traditional ones; even by the ninth grade many fewer girls then boys are considering careers in science or engineering. High schools females and minorities are underrepresented in computer, advanced science, mathematics, technology courses while males are greatly overrepresented in special education classes.

Lack of equal opportunity for females is especially prevalent in vocational education classess, where the majority of girls are enrolled in female intensive programs. This is especially serious in view of the vast disparity in the income of male and female workers (average income for males is double figures for females, according to the 1980 census), in that nontraditional skilled jobs offer the greatest income potential.

While various national reports and recommendations have focused on excellence in education, they have almost totally ignored the issues of access and equity for females, minorities, and the handicapped. In Wisconsin white males compose only approximately 36 percent of the school-age population, and we believe that excellence in education is imposible without equal opportunities for all students.

Since the narrow interpretation of Title IX rendered by the Supreme Court in the Grove City case and the defeat of the Civil Rights Act of 1984, there is no comprehensive federal legislation to prevent discrimination, and we urge the Education

and Labor Committee to support such protective legislation to ensure educational equity.

Very truly yours,

SHIRLEY JANE KAUB,
Chair.

[Excerpts From the Report]

THE REPORT OF THE NEW YORK HEARING ON OUR CHILDREN AT RISK: THE CRISIS IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

(Issued by Advocates for Children of New York, Inc.)

INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT

A year ago, in the midst of the general outcry over the state of our schools, a national network of youth and education advocates found we shared a growing fear. Our misgivings were not that the deficiencies of public schooling were suddenly receiving great attention. Most of us had been working for many years to bring the issues of school reform before the public eye, and all welcomed the new debate that a wave of commission reports and media coverage had engendered. The fear that reform advocates felt was that this debate was engaging too narrow a spectrum of voices, focusing on too limited a set of problems, encouraging short-sighted views of the solutions.

The crisis in public education was being defined as a crisis of "mediocrity," of declining standards and achievement which threatened the economic status of both individuals and the nation. Dire pronouncements were sounded about our inability to keep up with new technologies and global competition. What has been missing is concern for the enormous number of students our schools have been failing all along, concern for those whose economic future has been persistently shortchanged. What has been missing is a sense that at the root of school failure is not only the compromise of excellence, but the neglect of equity—and the sense that quality and equality in education go hand in hand.

For the crisis in public education has been with us a long time, if we measure the potential of education as a vehicle of opportunity and democratic values for our society. More than a problem of computer literacy is involved, when studies at Columbia's Teachers College tell us that 13% of all 17 year-olds are functionally illiterate. More than a problem of stricter graduation requirements is involved, when at least 28% of our children never finish high school, and more than 50% drop out of inner-city schools. More than a problem of "back to basics" and academic rigor is involved, when over half of the students eligible for compensatory education cannot get it, when two-thirds of non-English speaking students are not provided with special language services, when funds to the poorest school districts continue to be cut.

And what has been missing in the debate corresponds to the voices that have been left out of it. The prestigious national studies have not included the school constituents, those who daily confront school failure and the need for change. They have not included the parents whose children are underserved, the communities which are underfunded, the frontline educators who fight against losing odds, the advocates and activists who find themselves up against bureaucratic inertia and political indifference. Finally, and most importantly, the people left out are the *children at risk*, the permanent victims of chronic school crisis—poor children, inner-city kids, minorities and young women, students with special needs and handicapping conditions, the children of migrant workers. There are many dimensions to school improvement in this diverse nation, but we are not going to gain much ground if the problems of the disadvantaged are not a central priority of change—we will simply refashion a two-tiered system of education.

So we who are advocates for the children at risk made the decision to enter the debate, to broaden the voices and issues of reform, to join with others who fear that equity in education is getting lost in a one-sided quest for excellence. Through the National Coalition of Advocates for Students (NCAS), a Board of Inquiry was formed to conduct public hearings across the country, an inquiry into the crisis of educational disadvantage. The Board was co-chaired by Harold Howe II, former US Commissioner of Education, and Marion Wright Edelman, head of the Children's Defense Fund. The hearings focused on three areas which are key to inequity: the denial of equal access to school resources, the denial of equal quality in the learning

process, and the denial of open futures in the link between school and work—access, quality, jobs.

In New York, the public hearing on "Our Children at Risk: The Crisis in Public Education" was organized by Advocates for Children (NYC) and co-sponsored by Statewide Youth Advocacy (Rochester), both NCAS affiliate organizations. It was held on May 10–11, 1984, at the CUNY Graduate Center in New York City, before a State Board of Inquiry which included local community and education leaders as well as representatives from the National Board. The Hearing drew testimony from over 40 student and parent advocates, community and civic activists, teachers and administrators, all deeply engaged in school reform efforts.

Together these witnesses offered a unique survey of the needs, conflicts, innovations and potentials defined by direct experience in New York schools, which we have used as the basis for this report. While the bulk of the testimony covers conditions in New York City, the nation's largest school system, we found many parallel patterns and developments in the rest of the State, and many models for school improvement in projects across the country. The material is wide-ranging, and even so does not cover all possible issues, but it does convey the clear message that we must tackle the crisis in student achievement by examining the entire school system and its relation to our community needs and social values. In approaching this rather sweeping task, we have organized our findings in the following five sections:

(*a*) Economic and Social Conditions of School Crisis
(*b*) Underfunding School Services
(*c*) Problems and Dilemmas of an Unequal System
(*d*) New Approaches to School Improvement
(*e*) Conclusions for the Advocacy Movement

Within these topics, readers will find many issues familiar to school change advocates: imbalanced school aid formulas, understaffing, fragmented social services, cutbacks in entitlement programs, discriminatory testing and tracking practices, teacher burn-out, disorderly and demoralizing school environments, parent exclusion. Taken as a whole, the discussion of specific issues produced a great deal of common ground around some basic conclusions.

(1) School failure is not inevitable. There are indeed growing societal pressures on the schools resulting from rising poverty and underemployment, from increased social distress and changing family patterns. Yet testimony at the Hearing documented that where supportive resources are available, effective school programs have been established in the most deprived communities. The fact that these successes are not more widespread indicates the magnitude and complexity of change required throughout the system, not that the particular learning needs presented by disadvantaged children are the source of school crisis.

(2) School failure is an issue of public choices and commitments, not of rejected opportunities. Hearing witnesses demonstrated time and again that fiscal inequity is a underlying cause of inadequate schooling, a precondition of failure. New York City, which has 34% of the state's school enrollments and a student population with the highest levels of disadvantage, still receives only 30% of state funding. Federal education cutbacks and block granting have hit the inner cities the hardest. Schools with the highest drop-out rates receive a lower percentage of aid allocations.

(3) The results of resource denial and inequity are manifest everyday in the classroom: a demoralizing reminder to both teachers and students that their efforts are little valued by society at large. Children are placed at risk by overcrowded classrooms, by intolerable staff-to-student ratios, by crumbling school facilities, by impersonal learning environments, by the lack of supportive social services and even basic supplies, by outmoded and inflexible curricula, by our failure to attract and reward a capable teacher corp.

(4) The ingredients of school improvement are not a mystery. The single, most frequently cited factor for reversing school failure was securing high expectations for achievement among teachers, administrators, students and parents. Yet, high expectations are directly related to very tangible reforms in school practice and policy. One key ingredient is opening the schools to meaningful parent and community involvement, which has had significant impact in establishing a positive school climate. Another dimension of success is replacing the factory structures of schools with smaller classes, more personal contact between students and teachers, and learning programs which account for and respect individual and cultural diversity. Successful programs consistently provide high levels of supportive services within the school, addressing learning and social needs through integrated and collaborative approaches.

Effective schooling combats the stigmas and self-fulfilling prophesies which are produced by rigid tracking and the segregation of students through "creaming" and

"dumping" mechanisms. Effective schooling also addresses the patterns of institutional discrimination, which victimize minority, female, special needs students, and low-income students. However, not one of the ingredients of school improvement cited at the Hearing can be achieved on a widespread scale unless new commitments are made to both funding and re-structuring school services.

(5) Raising standards and requirements for student performance, without raising the level of fiscal, administrative and instructional support for school improvement, will exacerbate school failure. To create new barriers for school attainment and more selective mechanisms for advancement, when existing urban systems already underserve over half the children enrolled, will succeed only by pushing more students out. The Hearing focused particularly on the implications of the 1984 New York State Regents Action Plan, which imposes more strenuous academic requirements, but has yet answered the need to substantially increase state aid and insure that all students will have the means to meet its new standards.

If there is a single theme in these conclusions, it is that equity remains the central issue to the pursuit of excellence in public education. Equity is not just an matter of access, the right to attend school, although even this historic battle is far from universally won. Equity is not just a matter of being given the opportunity to achieve, if such "opportunities" are delivered by second-class schools which cannot serve students according to their needs. Equity means a commitment to two fundamental values in public education: that all children have the right to learn—and that the quality of our schools and our society depends on making that right a reality.

OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Testimony on parent involvement suggests the following general recommendations:

1. Include in all mandates for parent advisory bodies explicit standards for parental consultation, including the use of discretionary funds for training and participation, and the right to receive full information on program performance.
2. Utilize the skills and experience of active PTA, PA and PAC members to provide outreach, training and advocacy to other families.
3. Train educators as well as parents in effective techniques of parent involvement; accomodate the needs of parents, particularly those working or with small children, in structuring meetings, workshops and consultations.
4. Mandate state, district and local school Parent Advisory Councils (PACs) for all major categorical programs, according to the standards set in Head Start and Title I programs.

V. CONCLUSIONS FOR THE ADVOCACY MOVEMENT

How do policy-makers, educators, students, parents and citizens who care about our public schools build on scattered successes to make them the rule rather than the exception? How do we ensure that schools address the full range of needs of disadvantaged students, rather than using those needs as an excuse for school failure? How do we overcome the barriers to equity and excellence so sharply defined by the witnesses at the New York Hearing?

The following basic principles for improving public education guided much of the testimony and summarize our common concerns:

1. Schools work best when they are committed to serving all their students as effectively as possible. When schools cannot adequately serve all segments of their student body, every student suffers. When school districts and school systems serve some students far better than others, the entire system is devalued. Inequity and discrimination by race, sex and social class—and by educational need—are not only unjust, but corrosive to quality education.
2. Schools work best when they offer diverse and personal approaches in organization, curriculum, staffing and programming to meet the varieties of need among students. Smaller scale schools, smaller settings within schools, and reducted class size are essential ingredients for promoting diversity, without resort to the segregative and test-driven tracking policies so widely practiced today. Effective schools provide alternatives for all children.
3. Schools work best when they work collaboratively, affording principals, teachers, students, parents and communities the opportunity to participate in planning, problem-solving, decision-making, evaluation and school improvement.
4. Schools work best when they have considerable local discretion and can respond flexibly in meeting the particular needs of their students. State and local educational authorities have important responsibilities in safeguarding standards of equity

and excellence. However, prescriptions, formulas and regulations which are rigidly imposed on local schools by district and state administration often prove counter-productive to effective schooling. Over-direction often substitutes for supportive resources and prevents educators from exercising professional judgement, initiative and creativity.

5. Underfunding forces all schools to provide less than adequate education and creates crisis conditions for students most at risk. Federal, state and local education revenues must be significantly increased. The resources available for education must be based on need; the quality of education provided to our children should not be a function of the wealth of the community they reside in.

6. State and city government must not only maximize financial resources to schools, but must also ensure that those resources are effectively and fairly distributed. The state and city must ensure that students eligible for special services are accurately targeted and appropriately served. They must protect civil rights, monitor educational outcomes and provide additional assistance and guidance to schools where outcomes are unsatisfactory.

7. All state and city efforts to raise educational standards must be accompanied by the funds, staffing, training and supportive services necessary to make those standards achievable by all our students. Children whom schools have already failed should not encounter more barriers to achievement, but more support for school success. Standards must guide individual student performance, but more importantly, they must measure the school's performance. Addressing the catastrophic dropout problem should be a first priority in all programs for excellence.

8. The goals of schooling should not be determined by a narrow conception of job destinies, as they present themselves in today's labor market. Both vocational education and the general curriculum should encourage the creativity, self-motivation, and problem-solving skills which allow students to adapt flexibly to changing job prospects and to function as active citizens and fulfilled adults.

9. Schools should be places where respect for democratic values, diverse cultures and constitutional rights are taught by example. Not only the curriculum, but the organization and tone of the school must reflect these values.

The task of reforming and improving our schools requires a commitment to equity and excellence as interdependent goals. The reform process also requires that advocates of these goals act at every level of the education system and in the larger arenas of social policy and citizen action. The task of school reform requires organizing around our shared visions. It requires that we work together to inform and motivate legislators, advise and monitor school boards, challenge and support educators, engage new allies among concerned citizens, raise new expectations among underserved school communities.

Perhaps the most exciting aspect of the New York Hearing was that it gave a sense that this process is well underway, that the efforts of so many organizations and individuals are linked and mutually supportive. It is our hope that this report conveys the common ground we work on and the energy we can offer each other. If so, we will be a step closer to constituting the broad public coalition that can make quality education a priority for all our children.

Staten Island, NY, March 5, 1985.

Hon. MARIO BIAGGI,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Congressman Biaggi:

On February 19th you and the other members of the House Committee on Education and Labor heard the facts about New York City dropouts from Schools Chancellor Nathan Quinones. One announced reason for the committee's regional hearings was to seek ideas for federal education initiatives.

One proposal should be to authorize the formation of a national commission to recommend a simplified spelling system that would be phased into use over a 20-year period.

It is doubtful that such a national effort will ever be mounted if we wait for the academic community to act. Nor will the publishing industry do the job by itself. Only by combining the talents of educators, politicians, writers, publishers and media moguls will we get help for millions of poor youngsters who are trapped on a treadmill of despair.

In last Sunday's N.Y. TIMES book review section (page one), Jonathan Kozol (author of "Death at an Early Age") discussed "The Crippling Inheritance" of children whose parents are illiterate: "With more than half of nonwhite infants growing up in single-parent, female-headed homes, it is realistic to believe that those

who are their children stand in greatest jeopardy of entering the cycle of dependence that perpetuates itself from one illiterate generation to the next."

English spelling is especially difficult for students from other language backgrounds. I taught English as a second language at Curtis High School for about 20 of my 27 years there. Spanish speakers find English spelling a horror when compared to the very phonetic spelling of their own language.

Enclosed are two pamphlets on spelling reform. I hope you and the other members of the Education Committee will find a spot for spelling on your crowded agenda.

Sincerely,

RICHARD P. MUDGETT.

Two enclosures.

NEEDID: MOR REBLZ

(by Richard P. Mudgett)

". . . . a second American Revolution is called for, a revolution not of violence but of fulfillment, of fresh purposes, and of new directions."—"A Bicentennial Declaration" by the National Commission for the Bicentennial Era, John D. Rockfeller 3d, chairman

In the year 1975 a satellite spun in lonely orbit 22,000 miles above the Galapagos Islands. Its mission: to beam educational television programs to some 4300 students in remote regions of Appalachia, the Rocky Mountains and Alaska. . . .

In that same year a federally sponsored study by the University of Texas revealed that 23 million United States adults between 18 and 65 were functionally illiterate—unable to understand a help wanted advertisement or a supermarket price list.

In 1777 young Noah Webster hefted his musket against a British army marching toward Albany. His name was to become synonymous with *dictionary*, this Word Man of emerging America. Few people in the 20th century would remember him for his modest accomplishments in spelling reform:

—MOULD is in a new and simpler MOLD.
—PLOUGH has been mercifully PLOWed under!
—HONOUR, still dear to Brtions, is Americanized to HONOR.
—CATALOGUE is now quite respectable as CATALOG.
—COMPTROLLER, stubbornly retained by New York, adds up to a trimmer figure as CONTROLLER.
—REPUBLICKS still have problems as REPUBLICs.

But Webster proposed many more simplified spellings which I believe would have smoothed the path to literacy for every student of the English language which I taught for 27 years at Curtis High School in my home boro of New York City. Here are some Websterian proposals: altho, arkitecture, examin, ment, controling, crouded, faen (feign), neer, fether, giv, ieland, relm, kee, kord, fateeg, scool, noe, proov, hed, attentiv, beleev, kat, tuf, beneeth, and mareen.

Webster's America was wrapped in swaddling clothes and largely illiterate. Since everyone used money, however, it was possible for Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton and Gouverneur Morris to propel the young nation into the sensible system of decimal coinage that we use today. But it wasn't until December 1974 that the U.S. Treasury Department decreed that by January 1, 1979, liquor bottles must come in seven standard metric sizes!

Since we are finally falling into metric step with the rest of the world, why not start preparing for another basic educational reform? Godfrey Dewey, dean of American spelling reformers, points out that a word like "taken" could be spelled in 5,157,936 different ways. "One might be *phtheighchound* (compare *phthistic, weigh, school, glamour, handsome*)." (*English Spelling: Roadblock to Reading*, Teachers College Press, New York, 1971, p. 9)

The major thrust in education for the 1970s is the child's right to read. But there is an important corollary: the parent's *right to know* that the spelling still "taught" in our schools is a major hurdle in the rugged race toward higher reading skills.

Before 1925, phonics (or "sounding out" the letters of words) was the chief weapon in the reading teacher's arsenal. The "whole word recognition" took method over for the next 30 years. Then Rudolf Flesch's best-selling *Why Johnny Can't Read* jarred the nation's teachers into a new look at the phonics method and various blends of the two approaches percolated thru the educational bureaucracy.

Jeanne Chall and a team of reading researchers surveyed the period from 1912 to 1965 and concluded: ". . . . a code-emphasis method—i.e., one that views beginning

reading as essentially different form mature reading and emphasizes learning of the printed code for the spoken language—produces better results, at least up to the point where sufficient evidence seems to be available, the end of the third grade." (*Learning to Read: The Great Debate*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967, p. 307.)

Spelling constitutes a code that must be broken in order to understand the message. The code that we force our children to use is cumbersome enough to compel Secret Agent 007 to renounce blondes forever. Our language deserves a sane spelling system.

Understand please, that spelling reform would not alter *language*. A *roez*, would still smell like a *rose* and *seks* would still make the world go 'round.

Jak and Jil went up the hill
Too fech a pael ov wauter.
Jak fel doun and bro*k his kroun
And Jil kaem tumbling after.

That's how the old nursery ryhme would look in World English Spelling (WES), the product of over 60 years work by top American and British experts including the Pitmans (Sir Isaac and grandson Sir James) and the Deweys (Melvil of library fame and son Godfrey). I believe adoption of WES would save millions of teaching (and learning) hours and billions of dollars in remedial reading costs.

I want to emphasize that WES is a SYSTEM. Spell it SISTEM and it is still superior to the chaotic mess we now serve to our children.

cough—tough—bough—ought—through—hiccough—though

Seven different pronunciations for the same sequence of four letters = CHAOS!

kauf—tuf—bou—aut—thhroo—hikup—thoe

Simpler, aren't they? Notice how an extra *h* distinguishes the voiceless *th* sound (as in *through*) from the voiced sound (as in *though*). Note also that the WES versions are 13 letters shorter than their traditional equivalents.

foe—though—beau—bow (& arrow)—go

Here we have five different spellings for the same sound! Converted to WES they look like this: foe—thoe—boe—boe—goe.

The double occurrence of *boe* will create little or no confusion for a reader who must now sort out situations like the following:

1. "The audience loved you. Go out and take a *bou*."
2. "Tie a *bow* with that pretty yellow ribbon."
3. "Sally's *beau* is calling for her at eight."
4. "The *bough* of the tree broke in the storm."

For years I have listened sympathetically to the groans of my foreign students as they confronted obstacles like those four.

"A BILINGUAL PUZZLEMENT"

Consider the plight of Juan and José,
Who learned to pronounce every letter:
They dig in the ground a little hole
And find they like Spanish much better.

The average ten-year-old schoolboy in a Spanish speaking country can spell correctly almost any word in his language if it is clearly pronounced, even if he doesn't know what the word means! Spanish is one of the most phonetically spelled languages, while English is at the other extreme.

Spelling reforms have been effected in many other countries. Thirty years after the adoption of a phonetic alphabet, literacy in Turkey had risen from 9% to 59%. Russian, with 40 symbols, was changed several times even before the major reform in 1918. The Norwegians simplified their spelling in 1912. The mainland Chinese are now engaged in a switch to a phonetic Romanized alphabet.

The chief obstacle in our path to a simplified spelling system like World English Spelling is the wide variety of regional dialects. This is a knotty problem, but it's not very different from our present situation, in which we seek guidance from dictionaries that present very arbitrary guides to pronunciation. And don't we always find *kat* listed next to *cat*? Do you have much trouble in reading dialect in novels?

If WES were adopted, we would have to learn to live with a wider variety of spellings, but contextual clues would simplify the problem of comprehension. *Usage* determines the full meaning of a word.

WORLD ENGLISH SPELLING (WES)—A NO-NEW-LETTER PHONEMIC NOTATION FOR ENGLISH

World English Spelling offers substantially one spelling for each sound, one pronunciation for each spelling. It accomplishes this result with: (1) No new letters; (2) No diacritics (which, in effect, create new letters, for typing or printing); (3) As little disturbance of familiar forms and usages as practicable. Over 40 words out of 100 on the printed page retain precisely their present spellings.

WES is the outcome of long study—in Great Britain since 1910 and in the United States since 1946.

Symbol	*As in*	*Symbol*	*As in*
a	*at, man; ask; about, data*	o	*on, bother, not, was, what*
aa	*alms, father, bah; (ask)*	oe	*old, note, goes, so, coal, show*
ae	*age, main, say, air*	oi	*oil, point, boy*
ar	*army, market, far*	oo	*fool, move, group, rule, too*
au	*author, law, all, water, ought*	or	*order, north, for, story, more*
b	*bay, rubber, cab*	ou	*out, pound, now, bough*
ch	*check, church, watch*	p	*pay, happy, cap*
d	*down, ladder, bid*	r	*rate, married, dear*
e	*edge, men, said, head, any*	s	*seal, lesson, city, race, base*
ee	*each, here, see, be*	sh	*shall, pressure, nation, wish*
er	*further, collar, motor, murmur*	t	*town, letter, bit*
f	*fast, office, photograph, safe*	th	*that, rather, with*
g	*game, ragged, bag*	thh	*thought, nothing, both*
h	*had, behind, who*	u	*up, other, but, some, touch*
i	*it, him, pretty, give, any*	ue	*use, your, music, due, few*
ie	*ice, tie, kind, might, by*	ur	*further, her, early, first work*
j	*just, general, stage, judge*	uu	*full, sure, should, good*
k	*can, keep, account, back*	v	*vast, never, save*
l	*late, fellow, deal*	w	*wet, forward, one, quick*
m	*might, common, them*	wh	*which, everywhere*
n	*night, dinner, than*	y	*yet, beyond, million*
ng	*thing, long, going, single*	z	*zeal, puzzle, is, raise, size*
nk	*think, bank, uncle, ankle*	zh	*jabot, pleasure, vision, rouge*

Separate by a dot successive letters which might otherwise be read as a digraph—
short.hand, mis.hap, en.gaej, man.kiend
gae.eti, ree.elect, hie.est, loe.er, influu.ens, pou.er, emploi.ee

NOTES

The short vowel sounds are spelled a e i o u uu, as in "That pen iz not much guud."

A stressed short *a* or *o* before *r* is distinguished by doubling the *r*— karri, forren (compare kar, for)

The name sounds of the vowel letters are spelled with a following *e*—ae ee ie oe ue, as in "Thae seem liek soe fue."

The remaining long vowels and diphthongs are spelled aa au oi oo ou, as in "Faather taut boiz thhroo sound."

Except as a part of ch, c q x are used only in proper names.

The unstressed neutral vowel heard in *about*—*further*—*data* has no exact equivalent in WES, but is nearest to *u*. When this sound is stressed (which occurs only before *r*), write *u*—*wurk, further*. Initially or finally, retain the *a* of conventional spelling—*about, daeta*.

Medially, retain any single vowel of the conventional spelling, especially where the vowel may be stressed with its normal value in derivatives—*organ*, organik; rezident, rezidenshal; authhor, authhorriti; etc. In the termination most commonly spelled *-tion*, write *o*—naeshon. Write *the, a,* and *to* as in traditional orthography.

Write the symbol for *r* wherever "R-Keepers" (such as Mid-Westerners) would pronounce it.

Prefer, in general, pronunciations heard in careful, deliberate speech.

A Tiem for Reelz—A Plea for Spelling Reform

The New York State Board of Regents' proposals for various education reforms deal more with degree than with substance. They propose to fine tune a somewhat sluggish motor whose parts will remain essentially the same. Are we willing to settle for a brightly polished Edsel or would we be better off opting for a vehicle that is a 1983 creation?

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY THE SUBSTANCE OF EDUCATION?

The switch from Egyptian hieroglyphics to the Roman alphabet is one example of a change in substance. Dropping Roman numerals in favor of the Arabic is another. While nature remains pretty much the same, the facts that scientists discover about it create substantial changes in the curricula offered in the science classes of our schools.

George Bernard Shaw advocated radical changes in the form of a new alphabet. He so despised traditional orthography that he wrote his plays in Pitman shorthand and hired a secretary to transcribe his pothooks into the Romanized orthodoxy that too many of us take for granted as a sacred and unalterable code for communicating all the majesty and mystery of the English language.

NEEDED: A CLEAR ENGLISH CODE FOR THE COMPUTER AGE

English is almost alone among the major languages in its failure to revise spelling to reflect modern pronunciation. Germans, Turks, Finns and Russians—to cite a handful of examples—have updated the spelling of their languages. The mainland Chinese are making valiant efforts to institute Pinyin, a Romanized form of their language. The Japanese use a special simplified form of their language to introduce children to reading and writing. Modern Spanish is so phonetically regular in its spelling that few formal lessons are needed in that subject after the third or fourth grade of elementary school.

Sir James Pitman's initial teaching alphabet (i.t.a.) is a commendable step in the right direction, but its 44-character alphabet is not compatible with existing typewriters and computers. Some children find transition to traditional spelling from i/t/a is very tough obstacle course. A universal adoption of i/t/a, while technologically feasible, would be extremely expensive since existing typewriters could no longer be used and massive retraining of typists would be necessary.

The only other push comes from advertising, with Water *Pik*, family *pak*, *lite*, *thru* and many other shortcuts now familiar to millions of us.

WORLD ENGLISH SPELLING: A COMPATIBLE CODE

A no-new-letter phonemic notation for English completely compatible with present typing habits is World English Spelling (WES), the outcome of long study—in Great Britain since 1910 and in the United States since 1946. Scrabble addicts, however, will be distressed by the elimination of the q and x. The last page of this flyer bears the WES key and notes for its use. A sampl iz on paej thhree (+ heer!)

Speech recognition technology is still in its infancy. Its development is badly hampered by traditional spelling, an unsystematic hodgepodge that makes little sense to either a beginning reader or a computer. Machines for translating the printed word into speech (especially for the blind) could be greatly improved by the universal adoption of World English Spelling. Dialectal differences would present almost no problem for reading machines. But the opposite process—conversion of spoken words into print—would still have to solve some knotty problems in regional variations.

In our present situation we are forced to seek guidance from dictionaries that present very arbitrary guides to pronunciation. Regional differences are compounded by the silliness represented by such horrors as "gnome," "knife," "quick," "photo" and hundreds of other unphonemic beginnings. Silent letters, double consonants and homonyms also clutter what could be a much more orderly English spelling. Computer programing would be greatly helpt by "noem," "nief," "kwik," and "foetoe" and usage would determine meaning for "right"-"rite"-"write" (WES=riet) and the "there"-"their"-"they're" situations (WES=thaer). Anyone who thinks that

context is unimportant should look up "frog" in an unabridged dictionary. A zoologist, tailor, veterinarian and railroad worker do not use that word the same way!

SPELLING IS NOT LANGUAGE!

Spelling reform would not alter *language*. A "roez" would still smell like a "roee" and "seks" would still make the world go 'round! Simplified spelling would make learning to read a lot simpler. Our students would be better off studying vocabulary rather than wasting so much time solving pointless riddles in unphonemic spelling. For any purists concerned about world origins, there will always be etymological dictionaries. Native speakers of other languages survived major revisions of their spellings; so, too will our children, if English speaking adults will give them a break.

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS IN WORLD ENGLISH SPELLING

Forskor and seven yeerz agoe our faatherz braut forthh on this kontinent a nue naeshon, konseevd in liberti, and dedikaeted to the propozishon that aul men ar kreeaeted eekwal.

Nou wee are en.gaejd in a graet sivil wor, testing whether that naeshon, or eni naeshon soe konseevd and soe dedikaeted, kan long enduer. Wee ar met on a graet batlfeeld ov that wor. Wee hav kum to dedikaet a porshon ov that feeld az a fienal resting-plaes for thoez hoo heer gaev thaer lievz that that naeshon miet liv. It iz aultogether fiting and proper that wee shuud doo this.

But in a larjer sens, wee kanot dedikaet—wee knanot konsekraet—wee kanot haloe—this ground. The braev men, living and ded, hoo strugld heer, hav konsekraeted it far abuv our poor pou.er to ad or detrakt. The wurld will litl noet nor long remember whot wee sae heer, but it kan never forget whot thae did heer. It iz for us, the living, rather, to bee dedikaeted heer to the unfinisht wurk which thae hoo faut heer hav thus far soe noebli advanst. It iz rather for us to bee heer dedikaeted to the graet task remaening befor us—that from theez onord ded wee taek inkreest devoeshon to that kauz for which thae gaev the last fuul mezher ov devoeshon; that wee heer hieli rezolv that theez ded shal not hav died in vaen; that this naeshon, under God, shal hav a nue burthh ov freedom; and that guvernment ov the peepl, bie the peepl, for the peepl, shal not perish from the urthh.

With a 45% dropout rate in New York City and 26% statewide, our students need all the help we can possibly give them. Simplified spelling is a basic reform that is long overdue. Noah Webster and Benjamin Franklin advocated it in post-revolutionary times. Teddy Roosevelt was the only U.S. president who tried to do something about it. If you have any questions or comments, or if your group would like a lecture on the topic, please write or phone: Richard P. Mudgett, 191 Hillside Ave., Staten Island, NY 10304, Telephone: (212) 727-2664 (retired teacher of speech and English, Curtis High School, S.I.).

WORLD ENGLISH SPELLING

Symbol	As in	Symbol	As in
a	at, man, ask, about, data,	o	on, bother, not, was, what
aa	alms, father, bah (ask)	oe	old, note, goes, so, coal, show
ae	age, main, say, air	oi	oil, point, boy
ar	army, market, far	oo	fool, move, group, rule, too
au	author, law, all, water, ought, ought	or	order, north, for, story, more
b	bay, rubber, cab	ou	out, pound, now, bough
ch	check, church, watch	p	pay, happy, cap
d	down, ladder, bid	r	rate, married, dear
e	edge, men, said, head, any	s	seal, lesson, city, race, base
ee	each, here, see, be	sh	shall, pressure, nation, wish
er	further, collar, motor, murmur	t	town, letter, bit
f	fast, office, photograph, safe	th	that, rether, with
g	game, ragged, bag	thh	thought, nothing, both
h	had, behind, who	u	up, ohter, but, some, touth
i	it, him, pretty, give, any	ue	use, your, music, due, few
ie	ice, tie, kind, might, by	ur	further, her, early, first, work
j	just, general, stage judge	uu	full, sure, should, good
k	can, keep, account, back	v	vast, never, save
l	late, fellow, deal	w	wet, forward, one, quick
m	might, common, them	wh	which, everywhere
n	night, dinner, then	y	yet, beyone, million
ng	thing, long, going, single	z	zeal, puzzle, is, raise, size
nk	think, bank, uncle, ankle	zh	jabot, pleasure, vision, rouge

Separate by a dot successive letters which might otherwise be read as a digraph: short.hand, mis.hap, en.gaej, man.kiend, gae.eti, ree.elekt, hie.est, loe.er, influu.ens, pou.er, emploi.ee

The short vowel sounds are spelled a e i o u uu, as in "That pen iz not much guud." The name sounds of the vowel letters are spelled with a following e—ae ee is oe ue, as in "Thae seem liek soe fue." The remaining long vowels and diphthongs are spelled as au oi oo ou, as in "Faather taut boiz thhroo sound."

Except as a part of ch, c q x are used only in proper names.

The unstressed neutral vowel heard in about further data has no exact equivalent in World English Spelling, but is nearest to u. When this sound is stressed (which occurs only before r), write u—wurk, further. Initially or finally, retain the a of conventional spelling—about, daeta. Write *the*, *a*, and *to* as in traditional orthography.